

Before the Independent Hearings Panel
Wellington City Council

Under: the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

in the matter of: Submissions and further submissions in relation to the
proposed Wellington District Plan (Hearing Stream 1)

and: **Ryman Healthcare Limited**
Submitter ID: 346 and FS 128

and: **Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand
Incorporated**
Submitter ID: 350 and FS 126

Statement of Evidence of **Philip Hunter Mitchell** on behalf of
Ryman Healthcare Limited and the Retirement Villages
Association of New Zealand Incorporated (Planning)

Dated: 7 February 2023

Reference: Luke Hinchey (luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com)
Hadleigh Pedler (hadleigh.pedler@chapmantripp.com)

chapmantripp.com
T +64 9 357 9000
F +64 9 357 9099

PO Box 2206
Auckland 1140
New Zealand

Auckland
Wellington
Christchurch



**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF PHILIP MITCHELL ON BEHALF OF
RYMAN HEALTHCARE LIMITED AND THE RETIREMENT VILLAGES
ASSOCIATION OF NEW ZEALAND INCORPORATED**

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Philip Hunter Mitchell.
- 2 I hold the degrees of Bachelor of Engineering (Hons) and Doctor of Philosophy, both from the University of Canterbury. I am a Partner in the consulting practice Mitchell Daysh Limited and am based in the firm's Auckland office. Mitchell Daysh Limited was formed through a merger between Environmental Management Services Limited and Mitchell Partnerships Limited, which I established in July 1997. Previously, I was the Managing Director of Kingett Mitchell & Associates Limited, a firm that I co-founded in 1987.
- 3 I am a past president of the Resource Management Law Association and a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I was a recipient of the New Zealand Planning Institute's Distinguished Service Award in 2015.
- 4 I have been engaged in the field of resource and environmental management for more than 35 years and I have had a lead role in many significant planning and consenting projects throughout New Zealand during that time. My specialist areas of practice include providing resource management advice to the private and public sectors, facilitating public consultation processes, undertaking planning analyses, managing resource consent acquisition projects and developing resource consent conditions.
- 5 I am an accredited Hearings Commissioner (with a Chair's endorsement) and have acted as a Hearings Commissioner on numerous occasions, many in the role of Hearing Chair. Most recently I was the Chair of the Independent Hearings Panel for the Waikato Proposed District Plan.
- 6 I was an appointed mediator / facilitator for the hearings on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (*PAUP*). I was also appointed jointly by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery and the

Christchurch City Council as a Hearings Commissioner for the replacement of the Christchurch City District Plan (the district plan that is intended to facilitate the rebuilding of Christchurch). Retirement village planning provisions were a key topic in those processes resulting in bespoke provisions being inserted into both of these plans.

- 7 My work regularly takes me all over New Zealand and I have significant experience in resource management issues associated with retirement villages.
- 8 I have prepared this statement of evidence at the request of the Retirement Village Association (*RVA*) and Ryman Healthcare Limited (*Ryman*).
- 9 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the following documents:
 - 9.1 National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (*NPS-UD*);
 - 9.2 The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (*Enabling Housing Act*);
 - 9.3 Wellington Regional Policy Statement (*WRPS*);
 - 9.4 Proposed Wellington District Plan (*Proposed Plan*) and accompanying Section 32 Part 1 Report;
 - 9.5 Submissions and further submission on behalf of the RVA and Ryman;
 - 9.6 Section 42A report – Part 1, plan wide matters and strategic direction dated 20 January 2023 (*section 42A report*) and section 42A overview report; and
 - 9.7 The statement of evidence of Kirdan Ross Lees (dated 18th January 2023), Orla Hammond (dated 19th January 2023); and Phillip Osborne (dated 20th January 2023).

EXPERT WITNESS CODE OF CONDUCT

- 10 I have read the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained within the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I am satisfied that the matters which I address in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 11 My evidence will:
- 11.1 For context, provide an overview of the submissions by Ryman and the RVA that are relevant to Hearing Stream 1;
 - 11.2 Comment on the overall planning framework that applies to the Proposed Plan, including the requirements under section 32 of the RMA and the relevant provisions of the NPS-UD and the WRPS;
 - 11.3 Comment on the specific planning matters raised in the submissions that are relevant to Hearing Stream 1 and provide my response to the recommendations in the section 42A report; and
 - 11.4 Set out my conclusions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/OVERVIEW

- 12 This statement of evidence relates to the hearing on submissions with respect to Part 1 – Introductions and General Provisions and the Strategic Directions set out in Part 2 – District Wide Matters of the Wellington City Proposed District Plan.
- 13 In summary, the submissions by Ryman and the RVA seek to ensure that the Proposed Plan provides a planning regime that:
- 13.1 recognises and responds to the needs of an ageing population within Wellington City (*the City*); and

- 13.2 adopts provisions that are fit for purpose for the functional and operational characteristics of retirement villages and their residents' housing and care needs.
- 14 To assist the Panel, key aspects of the submissions by the RVA and Ryman, and which I address at a high level in my evidence, are set out below, noting my understanding that the RVA and Ryman intend to lodge comprehensive technical expert and company evidence to support these (and other aspects of their submissions) at the later hearings:
- 14.1 The proportion of New Zealanders moving into their retirement years is growing, including in Wellington. Their accommodation and healthcare needs are therefore also growing. The demand for retirement villages is already outstripping supply and the population aged 75+ is forecasted to more than double up to 833,000 people nationally by 2048.¹ As identified below, Wellington City is one of the fastest growing cities in the country. The ageing population in Wellington and how the planning framework responds to that is therefore considered to be a key issue in this hearing process.
- 14.2 The submitters seek to ensure that the Proposed Plan is consistent with the requirements and expectations of the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Act and its medium density residential standards (*MDRS*). They consider there are many aspects of the notified plan that go beyond those requirements and expectations leading to over-regulation or insufficiently clear regulation. Conformity with, and giving effect to, the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Act is also considered to be a key issue for the Proposed Plan.
- 14.3 More specifically, the RVA and Ryman consider that the notified planning regime does not adequately provide for retirement villages. As proposed, although retirement villages are a subset of multi-unit residential activity, and

¹ Jones Lang LaSalle, NZ Retirement Villages and Aged Care Whitepaper, June 2021, page 7.

therefore generally fit under the MDRS category of “four or more” residential units, the MDRS, with its focus on typical “residential units”, does not provide for retirement villages nor the different specialist units and amenities within them particularly well. Therefore, the RVA and Ryman have used the MDRS as a “base case” for the relief they seek and adapted it to ensure they account for the unique needs and features of retirement villages and their residents.

- 15 Additionally, I note that the RVA and Ryman are seeking the same or very similar relief in all other Tier 1 Council’s District Plans with the view to achieving much greater national consistency. In my opinion, that consistency is particularly important, given that the treatment of retirement villages across New Zealand is currently widely inconsistent which, in turn, adds to complexity and consenting timeframes. The NPS-UD directions, the Enabling Housing Act provisions and the National Planning Standards also seek greater national consistency when planning for housing-related activities.
- 16 I acknowledge that, although guided by these national policy and legislative directions, each District Plan is prepared in isolation from the others. Achieving complete national consistency will be challenging as a result. However, as an overarching point, I consider that the Proposed Plan’s approach to regulating retirement villages in typical residential zones in Wellington City does not justify a materially different approach than for typical residential zones in other Tier 1 Council plans (leaving aside the separate issue of qualifying matters, which must be based on local circumstances). I observe that the differences in the Proposed Plan versus other Tier 1 Council plans often relate to drafting style and emphasis rather than material matters of substance. The more material differences between the various regimes I have seen appear to arise from differing interpretations as to how much discretion councils have to go beyond the core requirements of the NPS-UD and the Enabling

Housing Act. The extent of this discretion will be addressed further in the submitters' opening legal submissions.

OVERVIEW OF THE SUBMISSIONS BY RYMAN AND THE RVA

- 17 As explained in the RVA submission, rapidly changing demographics are resulting in major pressures on social and health services for older New Zealanders, including the provision of housing. The submissions explain details of the Wellington region's and Wellington City's ageing population. Put simply, the population of people living in Wellington over the age of 65 is continuing to increase and is projected to continue to increase through to 2031 and beyond. As the submissions note, the 75+ age bracket is a particularly vulnerable demographic due to relative frailty and the increase of heightened care needs. The demand for retirement living and a range of care options, including dementia care and assisted living options, is growing.
- 18 In my experience, there are a number of challenges in finding suitable sites for the development of new retirement villages given the size of the sites that are typically required (which generally need to provide a range of living and care options, as well as on-site amenities), and the desire of prospective residents to remain close to their families and existing communities. This challenge is also discussed in the RVA submission.
- 19 A key overarching point raised in the submissions by the RVA and Ryman is that the Proposed Plan does not adequately address the needs of the retirement village sector in Wellington. While both submissions recognise that there are some enabling provisions for them in the Proposed Plan, it needs to provide a more nuanced planning framework to enable the establishment of retirement villages, particularly in the City's residential areas. In this regard, the Proposed Plan acknowledges the residential function of retirement villages and provides for a diversity of housing typologies in residential zones (including retirement villages) – and provides

that it does not create a presumption of traditional single storey, standalone dwellings on moderately sized lots.

- 20 In my opinion, responding to the issues associated with an ageing population and provision of suitable housing for this demographic across both the residential and commercial zones of Wellington is critical to enable housing to meet the needs of the elderly residents and ensuring the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities in Wellington City in accordance with Objective 1 of the Enabling Housing Act.
- 21 In this regard the requirements of the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Act have, in my opinion, fundamentally altered the expectations for development in and around residential zones in Tier 1 local authorities such as Wellington City. There are significantly greater expectations for bulk and density in residential zones, and an associated reduction in regulation of neighbourhood character and private residential amenity effects. Likewise, there is an expectation that any existing built form in residential communities will need to change to support the necessary increases in demand for housing.

OVERVIEW OF THE PLANNING FRAMEWORK

- 22 **National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020**
The NPS-UD directs local authorities to enable greater land supply for urban development. It also directs that planning is responsive to changes in demand, while also seeking to ensure that new development capacity enabled by local authorities is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. It also requires local authorities to remove overly restrictive rules that affect urban development outcomes in cities.
- 23 The section 42A overview report describes what the authors consider to be the key matters of relevance to the Proposed Plan that emerge from the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD.² I consider that the reporting officers have not given sufficient

² Paragraphs 74-86 and 105-108, section 42A overview report.

consideration to the following directives of the NPS-UD, in particular that:

- 23.1 Planning decisions ensure that urban environments provide for the needs of all demographics in the community, including by enabling a variety of dwelling types and price points;³
 - 23.2 Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets;⁴ and
 - 23.3 Urban environments, including their amenity values, will develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people and communities, and future generations.⁵
- 24 In effect, it is my understanding that the intent of the NPS-UD is primarily to be enabling of both business and residential development in urban environments through the provision of opportunity, choice, variety and flexibility of land supply for housing and business, subject of course to maintaining an appropriate level of residential amenity. As I discuss later in my evidence, and as will be further canvassed at further hearings, I consider the Proposed Plan needs to expressly recognise the diversity of housing stock that will be needed in residential and commercial areas of the City.
- 25 The Enabling Housing Act directs⁶ the provision of medium density residential standards for Tier 1 local authorities through Schedule 3A of the RMA. It also requires that a variety of housing types and sizes are provided for, which respond to housing needs and demand, and the neighbourhood's planned urban built character (including 3-storey buildings).
- 26 The Enabling Housing Act has also altered the scale / scope of residential development that can occur as a permitted activity in a

³ Objective 1 and Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.

⁴ Objective 2 of the NPS-UD.

⁵ Objective 4 and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.

⁶ Section 77G, Enabling Housing Act.

medium density residential zone.⁷ These new provisions essentially narrow the consideration of density effects in relation to on-site amenity and effects on the surrounding environment (when compared to existing district plans).

- 27 I consider that the clear legislative direction is that the built form of Wellington City will need to change in order to provide for the housing demands of a range of demographics. Therefore, in my opinion the strategic direction provided by the Proposed Plan needs to clearly reflect this expectation.

Wellington Regional Policy Statement

- 28 The Proposed Plan is required to give effect to the WRPS.⁸
- 29 The section 42A report notes that a submission from Wellington Regional Council has sought amendments to the Proposed Plan in part to achieve alignment with its notified Plan Change 1 to the WRPS (*Plan Change 1*). Plan Change 1 was notified on 19 August 2022 with the purpose of implementing and supporting the NPS-UD and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (*NPS-FM*).
- 30 The operative WRPS includes objectives and policies relating to maintaining and enhancing a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form,⁹ identifying that housing design and quality of housing developments can have a significant role in improving housing choice and affordability.
- 31 Plan Change 1 introduces new objectives and policies to the WRPS to enable urban development including housing and infrastructure to ensure housing intensification and improve housing affordability and housing choice. As outlined in the Plan Change 1 section 32 report the outcome sought is to enable greater flexibility and choice in

⁷ Schedule 3A, Enabling Housing Act.

⁸ Unless as provided for by s77G (8), RMA, which states "*The requirement in subsection (1) to incorporate the MDRS into a relevant residential zone applies irrespective of any inconsistent objective or policy in a regional policy statement.*"

⁹ Objective 22, WRPS.

housing which will better meet people's needs and lifestyle preferences in line with the MDRS provisions.

- 32 The section 42A report provides a brief summary of the purpose of the WRPS, however I consider that key aspects of Plan Change 1 to the WRPS and the operative WRPS are relevant to the development of planning provisions in Wellington City including:

32.1 Providing for a compact urban form including a range of housing;¹⁰ and

32.2 Housing affordability to be addressed, including enabling intensification.¹¹

SPECIFIC PROVISION FOR RETIREMENT VILLAGES

PART 1 INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

- 33 Before addressing this topic, I note that Ryman and the RVA have lodged submissions and further submissions on a number of existing and proposed new definitions. However, I understand from the section 42A report that the current hearing stream only addresses definitions that are plan-wide or are not otherwise better addressed in subsequent streams.¹² I have accordingly only addressed the definitions discussed in the section 42A report as they relate to the RVA and Ryman submissions. I also note I have addressed the definitions 'by exception' where I do not agree with the council officer's reasoning or recommendations.

Ngā Tautuhinga - Interpretation

Definitions

- 34 The RVA and Ryman filed submissions with respect to the definitions contained within Part 1 – Interpretation. In particular, the RVA and

¹⁰ Objective 22, Policy 31 and 55 WRPS.

¹¹ Objective 22, Policy 31 & 55 and Policy UD 3 PC1 WRPS.

¹² Paragraph 517, section 42A report.

Ryman sought the definitions of 'Health Care Facility' and 'Multi-unit housing' be amended to exclude retirement villages.

'Health Care Facility'

- 35 The section 42A report ultimately agrees with this submission point with regard to 'Health Care Facility' and recommends excluding retirement villages from that definition.¹³
- 36 However, I wish to comment on the statements at paragraphs 587 and 590, where the author states that retirement villages should not be treated as a residential activity. It may not be the author's intention, but I strongly disagree that retirement villages are not a residential activity. The Proposed Plan and the National Planning Standard (*NPS*) definition of retirement village make it clear that they are, "*A managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people.*" The definitions also acknowledge that any related recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities and the like are "*for the residents*". Also, in my experience, retirement villages are places where people reside, no matter what level of care they are also receiving, or access that they have to onsite recreation and amenities. That definition also applies regardless of the scale of effects or the ancillary activities.
- 37 That said, I generally agree with the section 42A report¹⁴ that it is appropriate to manage retirement village activities through a bespoke activity class – which is what the RVA and Ryman submissions requested.

'Multi-unit development'

- 38 I disagree with the section 42A report's recommendation at paragraph 609, that retirement villages should not be excluded from the definition of 'Multi-unit development'. The report writer states that as retirement villages are specifically provided for throughout

¹³ Paragraph 589, section 42A report.

¹⁴ Paragraph 589, section 42A report.

the plan, it should be clear to users that the multi-unit definition does not apply to retirement villages.

- 39 First, I note that the section 42A report’s reasoning appears to be inconsistent with the report’s reasoning in relation to the definition of “Health Care Facility”, where they recommend the opposite approach. Further, as discussed above, it is my opinion that retirement villages are a residential activity, and therefore, they could fall under both the definition for ‘multi-unit development’ and “retirement village”. An amendment to this definition is required to make this clear.

‘Supported residential care activity’

- 40 For similar reasons, I consider the definition of supported residential care activity should provide a specific exclusion for retirement villages (noting the section 42A report does not oppose this amendment “*for the sake of clarity*”).¹⁵

TE AHUNGA Ā-RAUTAKI - PART 2 DISTRICT WIDE MATTERS – STRATEGIC DIRECTION

- 41 The RVA and Ryman filed a number of submissions on the Strategic Directions section of the Proposed Plan. The details are briefly set out as follows.

Tāone Kāwana – Capital City

- 42 Objective CC-O2, as notified, states:

Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where:

- 1. A wide range of activities that have local, regional and national significance are able to establish and thrive;*
- 2. The social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of current and future residents is supported;*
- 3. Mana whenua values and aspirations become an integral part of the City’s identity;*

¹⁵ Paragraph 684, section 42A report.

4. *Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations;*
5. *Innovation and technology advances that support the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of existing and future residents are promoted; and*
6. *Values and characteristics that are an important part of the City's identity and sense of place are identified and protected.*

- 43 The RVA and Ryman submissions supported CC-O2 in part but requested clauses 3 and 6 be amended to ensure consistency with the expectations for urban intensification across Wellington City.
- 44 The section 42A report has recommended retaining CC-O2, as notified, because the notified wording provides for urban intensification across the City. The section 42A report goes on to state¹⁶ that the two clauses of the objective "*recognise that in an intensifying Wellington City, there are natural and physical resources with comparatively higher value that if protected can contribute positively to a changing sense of place and identity*".
- 45 While I accept the general rationale provided in the section 42A report, I support the more specific submission points made by Ryman and the RVA. I accept that values and characteristics that are an important part of the City's identity and sense of place may in some cases outweigh the needs of urban intensification. But in others they may not. In view of the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Act direction, decision-makers will need to be careful not to over-prioritise or "protect" areas, where to do so would not achieve the NPS-UD and Enabling Housing Act requirements. Accordingly, in

¹⁶ Paragraph 828, section 42A report.

my view, the objective requires some additional balance as per the below tracked changes:

CC-O2

Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where:

- 1. A wide range of activities that have local, regional and national significance are able to establish and thrive;*
- 2. The social, cultural and economic and environmental wellbeing of current and future residents, and the environment is supported;*
- 3. Mana whenua values and aspirations ~~become an integral~~ are recognised as part of the City's identity;*
- 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations;*
- 5. Innovation and technology advances that support the social, cultural, and economic and environmental wellbeing of existing and future residents and supports the environment is promoted; and*
- 6. Values and characteristics that are an important part of the City's identity and sense of place are ~~identified-recognised~~ and where appropriate protected.*

Ngā Rawa me te Tūāhanga ā-Rautaki o te Tāone - Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure

- 46 The strategic level framework for infrastructure is set out in the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure section of the Proposed Plan.
- 47 The RVA and Ryman sought that SCA-O2 be amended and for SCA-O3 to be deleted, due to concerns over the details of the requirements for providing an increase in infrastructure capacity and incorporating additional infrastructure into new urban developments.

The section 42A report does not support this and states¹⁷: *"I do not agree with Retirement Villages Association [350.14] that clause two of the objective should be deleted. The intent of the objective is that when development occurs in places where infrastructure capacity is not in place that this is met by the development and that land is well utilised to contribute a significant increase in development (i.e., if land is to be developed it is developed at a higher, rather than lower density). I do not consider that deletion of this clause is consistent with submission point."*

- 48 In my opinion, the rationale provided in the section 42A report does not adequately recognise the situation where a development provides its own infrastructure (and internalises its effects on the public system), as is often the case with retirement villages. One examples of this is Ryman's Malvina Major Retirement Village in Johnsonville, Wellington. Furthermore, it is well established that retirement villages place a lower demand on infrastructure due to them being largely self-contained environments and the practical realities of the needs of older people.
- 49 In my opinion, there does not appear to be a sound justification for the additional policy requirement in (2) which states *"and... supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City."* If a development can meet its own infrastructure needs or meet the relevant costs, the contribution towards providing development capacity seems irrelevant. This policy should not be a basis for delaying these projects, which can adequately manage their infrastructure impacts.
- 50 The section 42A report writer further notes that in relation to SCA-O3, *"at a strategic level it is important that new development incorporates additional infrastructure and that this is positioned at such a level"*,¹⁸ and therefore does not agree with the submission point to delete this objective. I disagree, primarily because

¹⁷ Paragraph 1010, section 42A report.

¹⁸ Paragraph 1016, section 42A report.

retirement villages often provide for “public open space, community and social infrastructure” as outlined above.

51 Accordingly, the amendments I propose are as follows:

SCA-02

New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, or where this is not the case the development:

1. *Can meet the development infrastructure costs associated with the development, ~~and; or~~*
2. *~~Supports a significance increase in~~ Can meet the development capacity for the City infrastructure requirements of the development*

~~SCA-03~~

~~*Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-06Z or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale.*~~

Te Whakaukatanga, Te Manawaroa me te Āhuarangi Hurihuri - Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change

52 As notified, Objective SRCC-04 states “*Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes that provide opportunities for carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation.*”

53 The RVA and Ryman submission in relation to SRCC-04 requested this provision be deleted as it is vague and uncertain.

54 The section 42A report did not agree and stated there was a “*requirement to manage the risks from natural hazards and its related responsibilities under the Act*”, and instead recommended an amendment to the Objective.

55 The proposed amendment recommended within the section 42A report¹⁹ provides greater flexibility for developments to be

¹⁹ Paragraph 1106, section 42A report.

considered on a case-by-case basis. I consider the change to be an improvement, however, I am still of the opinion SRCC-O4 should be deleted because the concepts are very broad and therefore need to provide greater clarity and do little more than restate the provisions of the RMA.

Te Āhua Tāone me te Whanaketanga – Urban Form and Development

- 56 The strategic framework for the future growth and development of urban areas is set out in the Urban Form and Development section of the Proposed Plan.
- 57 The RVA and Ryman made a number of submission points relating to Objectives UFD-O1, UFD-O2, UFD-O3, UFD-O6 and UFD-O7 with amendments generally sought to address, recognise and provide for the unique characteristics of retirement village developments and their residents.
- 58 The section 42A report rejects these submissions on the basis that these strategic directions are appropriately positioned and are further refined to specific activities as relevant throughout the plan.²⁰
- 59 The submissions by Ryman and the RVA generally supported the urban form and development strategic objectives of the Proposed Plan to the extent that they reflect the MDRS. The key area of opposition was in relation to the potential constraints of urban development that is not in line with the direction of the MDRS. While I understand that retirement village operators may desire sites close to transport corridors, a much more important factor is available land area and the catchment demographic.
- 60 I therefore consider that reference to medium density in UFD-O3 is unnecessary, as the MDRS is intended to apply across all residential zones.
- 61 In my view the strategic urban form and development objectives need to ensure intensification that provides a choice and diversity of

²⁰ Paragraphs 1169, 1173, 1181 and 1186, section 42A report.

development providing for all of the community to ensure a well-functioning urban environment. I agree with the amendments sought by the RVA and Ryman to provide greater clarity to the objectives and ensure the objectives flow through to the rest of the Plan. Suggested wording is as follows:

UFD-O2

Urban development in ~~identified~~ greenfield areas:

- 1. Is environmentally and ecologically sensitive;*
- 2. Makes efficient use of land;*
- 3. Is well-connected to the public transport network; ~~and~~*
- 4. Provides for a mixture of land uses and activities, where feasible; and*
- 5. Reinforces the City's compact urban form.*

UFD-O3

~~Medium to High~~ density and assisted housing developments are encouraged ~~located~~ in areas that are:

- 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or*
- 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and*
- 3. Served by public or on-site open space and other social infrastructure.*

UFD-O7

Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety now and into the future.

Development will achieve this by considering:

- 1. Being accessible and well-designed;*

2. *Supporting sustainable travel choices, including active and micromobility modes;*
3. *Being serviced by the necessary infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment;*
4. *Being socially inclusive;*
5. *Being ecologically sensitive;*
6. *Respecting of the City's historic heritage;*
7. *Providing for community well-being; and*
8. *Adapting over time and being responsive to an evolving, more intensive surrounding context.*

CONCLUSION

- 62 New Zealand's ageing population is increasing and the demand for retirement villages is outstripping supply. This is particularly evident in the demand being experienced by members of the RVA and by Ryman.
- 63 As noted within this evidence, the submissions by the RVA and Ryman are seeking to ensure that the Proposed Plan provides a consistent and enabling regulatory framework for the establishment of retirement villages within Wellington City.
- 64 Overall, I agree with the submissions by Ryman and the RVA that further amendments to the strategic framework provisions are warranted in order to provide a planning framework that appropriately gives effect to the NPS-UD, responds to the retirement housing and care shortage, and enables a consistent approach across the country.

Phil Mitchell

7 February 2023