

Section 32 Evaluation Report

Part 2: High Density and Medium Density Residential Zones

Contents

Table of acronyms.....	3
1.0 Introduction to the resource management issues	4
2.0 Residential Zones.....	4
3.0 Reference to other evaluation reports.....	5
4.0 Strategic Direction	5
5.0 Regulatory and policy direction	7
5.1 RMA Part 2 (Sections, 6, 7 and 8).....	7
5.2 National and Regional Direction - National Policy Statements	8
5.2.1 Proposed National Policy Statements	9
5.2.2 National Environmental Standards	9
5.2.3 National Planning Standards	10
5.3 National Guidance Documents	10
5.4 Regional Policy and Plans.....	10
5.5 Iwi Management Plans.....	12
5.6 Relevant plans or strategies.....	12
5.7 Other relevant legislation or regulations.....	13
6.0 Resource Management Issues Analysis	13
6.1 Background	13
6.2 Evidence Base - Research, Consultation, Information and Analysis undertaken	14
6.2.1 Analysis of operative District Plan provisions relevant to this topic.....	15
6.2.2 Advice received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira	17
6.2.3 Consultation undertaken to date	18
6.3 Summary of Relevant Resource Management Issues.....	20
7.0 Scale and significance.....	22
7.1 Quantification of Benefits and Costs	25
8.0 Zone Framework.....	26
9.0 Overview of Proposal/s.....	26
10.0 Qualifying Matters.....	30
11.0 Evaluation of Proposed Objectives	32
11.1 Evaluation of HRZ and MRZ Objectives 1, 2 and 3.....	32
11.2 Evaluation of MRZ Oriental Bay Height Precinct – Objective 1	35
12.0 Evaluation of Proposed Policies, Rules and Standards	38
13.0 Conclusion.....	44

Table of acronyms

Abbreviation	Full term
DDP	Draft District Plan
HRZ	High Density Residential Zone
ISPP	Intensification Streamlined Planning Process
MDRAs	Medium Density Residential Areas
MDRS	Medium Density Residential Standard
MRZ	Medium Density Residential Zone
NES	National Environmental Standards
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPS-ET	National Policy Statement for Electricity Transmission 2008
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020
NZCPS	New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
OBHP	Oriental Bay Height Precinct
ODP	Operative District Plan
PDP	Proposed District Plan
PNRP	Proposed Natural Resources Plan
RPS	Regional Policy Statement
WCC	Wellington City Council

Overview and Purpose

1.0 Introduction to the resource management issues

Wellington is currently experiencing significant housing supply and affordability issues, with high house prices, rental costs, and a lack of affordable options.

According to the latest population projections¹, the City's population growth is in a range of 50,000 to 80,000 more people over the next 30 years.

The Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment Update 2022 confirms that, based on the current District Plan settings, Wellington City is facing a shortfall of 10,222 dwellings from that required to meet the projected population growth.

This will further compound the current housing supply and affordability issues. Changes are therefore needed to address these issues.

Increasing housing supply has been a key focus area of the 'Planning for Growth' programme.

Recent government direction² has also set clear direction that Wellington City Council as a tier 1 local authority must provide for well-functioning urban environments that have sufficient development capacity to meet the different needs of its people and communities.

2.0 Residential Zones

This section 32 evaluation report is focussed on two new residential zones in the Wellington City Proposed District Plan (PDP). This includes the High Density Residential Zone and the Medium Density Residential Zone. The Large Lot Residential Zone is subject to a separate Section 32 report.

High Density Residential Zone (HRZ)

The HRZ encompasses areas of the city located near to the City Centre Zone, Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone, and Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations. The zone provides for a range of housing types at a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone.

It gives effect to the requirements of the RMA to allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site, and also by enabling multi-unit housing of up to six storeys through a resource consent process.

It is anticipated that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the HRZ will change over time to a more intensive urban built form. A range of compatible non-residential uses that support the needs of local communities are also provided for in the HRZ.

Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ)

The MRZ comprises predominantly residential activities with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings.

¹ Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment Update 2022 (HBA)

² National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021

The suburbs within the MRZ have developed at different times and with varying topography and characteristics across its neighbourhoods.

The MRZ adopts the medium density residential standards³ from the RMA which allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site. Multi-unit housing of four or more units is also provided for through a resource consent process.

It is anticipated that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the MRZ will change over time.

A range of compatible non-residential uses that support the needs of local communities are also provided for in the HRZ.

Precincts within the MRZ include:

- Character Precincts;
- Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct;
- Oriental Bay Height Precinct.

There is a separate Section 32 evaluation report that addresses the Character and Townscape Precincts. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is included in this report.

3.0 Reference to other evaluation reports

There are a number of other Section 32 reports that are relevant to the residential zones.

The reports listed below are specifically relevant to the qualifying matters that apply within the residential zones.

Report	Relationship to this topic
Part 2: Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct	This MRZ chapter includes these Precincts.
Part 2: Natural and Coastal Hazards	There are number or natural and coastal hazards that are relevant to the residential zones.
Part 2: Heritage and Cultural Values	Within the residential zones there are heritage areas, buildings and structures, notable trees, and sites and areas of significance to Māori. All of these are addressed in the Heritage and Cultural Values Section 32 Report.
Part 2: Noise	There are specific controls in the noise chapter that apply to new residential development within the Inner and Outer Air Noise Overlays.

4.0 Strategic Direction

The following objectives in the Strategic Direction chapter of the PDP are directly relevant to the residential zones:

³ Excluding the MDRS standard relating to front and side yards.

CC-02	Capital City																				
Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where... 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations.																					
CC-03	Capital City																				
Development is consistent with and supports the achievement of the following strategic city objectives... 1. Compact: Wellington builds on its existing urban form with quality development in the right locations.																					
SCA-02	Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure																				
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 2. Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.																					
UFD-01	Urban Form and Development																				
Wellington's compact urban form is maintained with the majority of urban development located within the City Centre, in and around Centres, and along major public transport corridors.																					
UFD-03	Urban Form and Development																				
Medium to high density housing developments are 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 open space and other social infrastructure.																					
UFD-04	Urban Form and Development																				
In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected housing demand, the following housing bottom lines below are to be met or exceeded in the short-medium and long term in Wellington City as contained in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (Housing Update 2022).																					
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2021-2024</th> <th>2024-2031</th> <th>2031-2051</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Short</th> <th>Medium</th> <th>Long</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Demand figures</td> <td>4, 148</td> <td>8, 426</td> <td>18, 724</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Competitiveness margin</td> <td colspan="2">20%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing bottom line</td> <td colspan="2">15, 089</td> <td>21, 532</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2021-2024	2024-2031	2031-2051		Short	Medium	Long	Demand figures	4, 148	8, 426	18, 724	Competitiveness margin	20%		15%	Housing bottom line	15, 089		21, 532
	2021-2024	2024-2031	2031-2051																		
	Short	Medium	Long																		
Demand figures	4, 148	8, 426	18, 724																		
Competitiveness margin	20%		15%																		
Housing bottom line	15, 089		21, 532																		
UFD-06	Urban Form and Development																				
A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.																					
UFD-07	Urban Form and Development																				
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.																					

UFD-O8	Urban Form and Development
<i>Areas of identified special character are recognised and new development within those areas is responsive to the context and, where possible, enhances that character.</i>	

An evaluation of these objectives is contained in the companion Part 1 Section 32 Report.

5.0 Regulatory and policy direction

In carrying out a Section 32 analysis, an evaluation is required of how the proposal achieves the purpose and principles contained in Part 2 of the RMA.

Section 5 sets out the purpose of the RMA, which is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Sustainable management means:

“...managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety, while -

(a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

(b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and

(c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment”.

In achieving this purpose, authorities also need to:

- Recognise and provide for the matters of national importance identified in Section 6;
- Have particular regard to the range of other matters referred to in Section 7; and
- Take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi in Section 8.

5.1 RMA Part 2 (Sections, 6, 7 and 8)

The Section 6 matters that are considered to be specifically relevant to the residential zones are:

Section	Relevant Matter
s6(c)	<p><i>The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habits of indigenous fauna</i></p> <p>On 23 June 2022 the Wellington City Council Planning and Environment Committee resolved to remove Significant Natural Areas from the residential zones until the National Policy Statement on Biodiversity has been gazetted and a SNA incentives programme has been developed and considered by Council. SNAs still apply to all other zones throughout the City.</p>
s6(f)	<p><i>The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development</i></p> <p>The residential zones include heritage areas, buildings and structures. The necessary protection for the historic heritage within the residential zones is addressed in the Part 2 - Historic Heritage chapter of the PDP.</p>
s6(h)	<p><i>The management of significant risks from natural hazards</i></p>

	There are a range of natural hazard risks for the residential zones including flooding, fault rupture, liquefaction, coastal inundation and tsunamis. The management of the significant risks from these hazards is addressed in the Part 2 – Natural Hazards and the Part 2 – Coastal Environment chapters of the PDP.
--	---

The Section 7 matters that are considered to be specifically relevant to the residential zones are:

Section	Relevant Matter
s7(b)	<i>The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.</i> The efficient use of land within the residential zones is necessary to meet the strategic objectives of maintaining a compact urban form and providing new housing to help address the City's housing needs.
s7(c) and s7(f)	<i>Maintenance and enhancement of amenity values</i> <i>Maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment</i> Residential areas contain amenity values and environmental qualities that are valued by the community. The maintenance and enhancement of these values and qualities needs to be managed in the PDP alongside the need for the efficient use of land to increasing housing supply and choice.

Section 8 requires Council to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources.

Council has undertaken significant engagement with its mana whenua partners (Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika and Ngāti Toa Rangatira) to actively protect their interests in the development of the PDP. This included specific engagement on the new residential zones, particularly in relation to the recognition and protection of sites and areas of significance within these zones.

5.2 National and Regional Direction - National Policy Statements

There are five National Policy Statements (NPS) currently in force:

- NPS for Electricity Transmission 2008 (NPS-ET)
- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS)
- NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
- NPS for Freshwater Management 2020
- NPS on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)

Only the NPS-ET, NZCPS and NPS-UD are considered directly relevant to the residential zones as set out below.

NPS	Relevant Objectives / Policies
National Policy Statement for	The National Grid passes through various parts of Wellington City, including some areas in the residential zones.

Electricity Transmission 2008	<p>The NPS- ET has objectives and policies which aim to recognise the national significance of the electricity transmission network, facilitate the operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing transmission network and establish new transmission resources.</p> <p>The Part 2 – Infrastructure chapter of the PDP addresses the requirements of the NPS-ET through objectives, policies and rules that provide for the operation, maintenance and upgrade of the transmission network within the residential zones, in conjunction with provisions to manage adverse effects and reverse sensitivity effects within these zones.</p>
New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010	<p>There are parts of the residential zones alongside State Highway 2 and around the eastern bays to the south coast that are located within the coastal environment.</p> <p>The PDP includes overlays identifying the Coastal Environment and areas of high and very high coastal natural character.</p> <p>The Part 2 – Coastal Environment chapter addresses the requirements of the NZCPS in relation to the residential zones, including the management of coastal hazards.</p>
NPS on Urban Development 2020	<p>The following objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are specifically relevant to the residential zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8; and • Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8. <p>These objective and policies are addressed throughout the course of this evaluation report.</p>

5.2.1 Proposed National Policy Statements

In addition to the five National Policy Statements currently in force there are also two proposed NPS under development, noting that these are yet to be issued and have no legal effect:

- Proposed NPS for Highly Productive Land; and
- Proposed NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity.

The Proposed NPS for Highly Productive Land is not relevant to the residential zones.

The Proposed NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity is not relevant to the residential zones in the PDP. On 23 June 2022 the Wellington City Council Planning and Environment Committee resolved to remove Significant Natural Areas from the residential zones until the National Policy Statement on Biodiversity has been gazetted and a SNA incentives programme has been developed and considered by Council.

5.2.2 National Environmental Standards

There are nine National Environmental Standards (NES) currently in force:

- NES for Air Quality 2004

- NES for Sources of Human Drinking Water 2007
- NES for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009
- NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011
- NES for Telecommunication Facilities 2016
- NES for Plantation Forestry 2017
- NES for Freshwater 2020
- NES for Marine Aquaculture 2020
- NES for Storing Tyres Outdoors 2021

None of these are directly relevant to the residential zones noting that NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health is addressed in the Part 2 – Contaminated Land chapter of the PDP.

5.2.3 National Planning Standards

The National Planning Standards provide for five residential zone options.

The PDP utilises the Large Lot Residential Zone for the parts of the city located at the rural / urban interface.

The Low Density Residential Zone has been discarded for the city’s urban residential areas as it is inconsistent with the housing densities and intensification required to meet the identified housing needs.

The following zones are therefore considered to be appropriate for consideration for the city’s urban residential areas:

Zone	Description
High Density Residential Zone	Areas used predominantly for residential activities with high concentration and bulk of buildings, such as apartments, and other compatible activities.
Medium Density Residential Zone	Areas used predominantly for residential activities with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments, and other compatible activities.
General Residential Zone	Areas used predominantly for residential activities with a mix of building types, and other compatible activities.

5.3 National Guidance Documents

There is no national guidance that is specifically relevant to the residential zones.

5.4 Regional Policy and Plans

Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013 (RPS)

The table below identifies the specifically relevant provisions in the RPS for the residential zones.

Regional form, design and function	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective 22	<p>Objective 22 seeks, “A compact well designed and sustainable regional form that has an integrated, safe and responsive transport network and...</p> <p><i>(b) an increased range and diversity of activities in and around the regionally significant centres to maintain vibrancy and vitality...</i></p> <p><i>(d) urban development in existing urban areas, or when beyond urban areas, development that reinforces the region’s existing urban form...</i></p> <p><i>(g) a range of housing (including affordable housing)...</i>”</p>
Policy 31: Identifying and promoting higher density and mixed use development – district plans	<p>Policy 31 requires district plans to:</p> <p><i>(a) identify key centres suitable for higher density and/or mixed use development;</i></p> <p><i>(b) identify locations, with good access to the strategic public transport network, suitable for higher density and/or mixed use development; and</i></p> <p><i>(c) include policies, rules and/or methods that encourage higher density and/or mixed use development in and around these centres and locations,</i></p> <p><i>so as to maintain and enhance a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form.</i></p>
Policy 55: Maintaining a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form – consideration	<p>Policy 55 requires district plans to have particular regard to maintaining a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form and whether:</p> <p><i>(a) the proposed development is the most appropriate option to achieve Objective 22; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) the proposed development is consistent with the Council’s growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in that district; and/or</i></p> <p><i>(c) A structure plan has been prepared.</i></p>

Regional Plans

There are currently five operative regional plans and one proposed regional plan for the Wellington region:

- Regional Freshwater Plan for the Wellington Region, 1999
- Regional Coastal Plan for the Wellington Region, 2000
- Regional Air Quality Management Plan for the Wellington Region, 2000
- Regional Soil Plan for the Wellington Region, 2000
- Regional Plan for discharges to the land, 1999
- Proposed Natural Resources Plan, appeals version 2021

The proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP) will replace the five operative regional plans, with provisions in this plan now largely operative with the exception of those that are subject to appeal.

None of the regional plans are specifically relevant to the residential zones, noting that matters such as protecting natural character, managing land disturbance and adverse effects of land use activities on soil and water, and stormwater discharges are all addressed under other district-wide chapters of the PDP.

5.5 Iwi Management Plans

There are no Iwi Management Plans relevant to the residential zones.

5.6 Relevant plans or strategies

The following plans and strategies are specifically relevant to the residential zones.

Plan / Strategy	Organisation	Relevant Provisions
Wellington Regional Growth Framework 2021	GWRC, WCC, PCC, KCDC, HCC, UHDC, HDC, MDC, SWDC, MHUD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Regional Growth Framework provides a long-term vision for how the region will grow, change and respond to key urban development and environmental challenges and opportunities. It sets out opportunities and challenges at a regional level in relation to housing, infrastructure, natural hazards and climate change, natural environment, affordable housing choices for Māori, and access to social, education and economic opportunities.
Our City Tomorrow – He Mahere Mokowā mō Pōneke - A Spatial Plan for Wellington City 2021	WCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Spatial Plan is an integrated land use and transport strategy that sets the direction for how Wellington City will grow and change over the next 20-30 years The Spatial Plan sets out key development outcomes for the city, including how additional housing capacity will be provided. The residential zones in the PDP implement the strategic direction and outcomes set by the Spatial Plan.
Te Atakura – First to Zero 2019	WCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Te Atakura is the implementation plan to make Wellington City a zero-carbon capital by 2050. It identifies target areas for emissions reduction including urban form and transport.

5.7 Other relevant legislation or regulations

There is no other legislation or regulations considered relevant to the residential zones.

6.0 Resource Management Issues Analysis

6.1 Background

Wellington is currently experiencing significant housing supply and affordability issues, with high house prices, rental costs, and a lack of affordable options.

Recent population projections⁴ confirm that between 50,000 to 80,000 more people are expected to live in Wellington City over the next 30 years.

As set out in the 2022 HBA update:

- To cater for this population growth, Wellington will need to provide for an estimated 36,621 new dwellings between 2021 and 2051.
- Wellington City has capacity for 26,399 realisable dwellings over the period between 2021 and 2051.
- This represents a shortfall of 10,222 dwellings from that required to meet projected population growth.

Based on the current District Plan settings there will not be enough homes to meet the population increase. Changes are therefore needed to address these issues.

Recent government direction⁵ has also set clear requirements that Wellington City Council as a tier 1 local authority must provide for well-functioning urban environments that have sufficient development capacity to meet the different needs of its people and communities.

In response to this context the key issues for the new residential zones in the Wellington PDP are summarised as follows:

- The need to give effect to the NPS-UD and RMA Amendment Act to increase housing supply and choice, and provide for well-functioning urban environments. The operative District Plan does not give effect to the NPS-UD or the RMA Amendment Act, or to Council's adopted Spatial Plan.
- The need to provide a clear planning policy framework that enables increased density, but also provides for a balance between growth and amenity that reflects the direction set by the NPS-UD that urban environments and amenity values will change over time.
- The need to continue to accommodate and provide for appropriate non-residential uses within the residential zones that are of an appropriate scale and intensity, support community needs, and contribute to well-functioning urban environments.

⁴ Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment Update 2022 (HBA)

⁵ National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021

6.2 Evidence Base - Research, Consultation, Information and Analysis undertaken

The Council has reviewed the operative District Plan, commissioned technical advice and assistance from various internal and external experts, and carried out extensive consultation prior to notification of the PDP.

This work has been used to inform the identification and assessment of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions. This advice includes the following:

Title	Brief synopsis
<p><i>Inner and Outer Residential Areas - Background and Monitoring Report (November 2019), prepared by WCC</i></p>	<p>This report presents the findings of a review of resource consent data in relation to the Inner and Outer Residential Areas of the District Plan for the period 2009 – 2018. The report identified the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of consents analysed were for the Outer Residential Area – around 80%. • The majority of consents (63%) were for discretionary activities. • The majority of consents were non-notified (93%). • Applications are spread relatively evenly around the city. • 37% of the consents were for residential additions and alterations. • 27% were for new residential dwellings. • The most common rule triggered was for building recession plane breaches with over 40% of applications breaching these rules. • Site coverage (27% of applications), followed by earthworks (20% of applications) were the next most triggered rules.
<p><i>Outer Residential Area Infill Development – A Review of the Effectiveness of Current District Plan Provisions (February 2020), prepared for WCC by Urban Perspectives</i></p>	<p>This report examines the operative District Plan standards related to infill housing in the Outer Residential Area of the District Plan, and assessed their effectiveness in facilitating good infill housing outcomes.</p> <p>Key findings of this report are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Plan Change 56 has had a limiting impact on the amount of infill development occurring in the city. • The infill housing height limit was identified as a major constraint. • There is conflict within the operative District Plan provisions seeking increased housing and the maintenance of existing character and amenity.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the basis that infill housing needs to continue to provide a source of residential development capacity, the report recommended reviewing the current provisions and signalling a greater expectation of change whilst still ensuring an acceptable level of amenity.
<i>Planning for Residential Amenity (July 2021), prepared for WCC by Boffa Miskell</i>	<p>This report assessed measures that can be used to achieve a balance between amenity and the increased density envisaged by the NPS-UD.</p> <p>It provided recommendations on a suite of controls and standards that could be incorporated into the new District Plan.</p>
<i>Review of Residential Coastal Edge (March 2022), prepared for WCC by Boffa Miskell</i>	<p>This report reviewed the work carried out to define the Residential Coastal Edge as part of Plan Change 72, and assessed whether the evidence and reasons for providing special protection for the Residential Coastal Edge remain valid and robust today. It also took into account the new overlays and provisions in the Draft District Plan.</p> <p>The report concluded that it was not necessary to carry over the current Residential Coastal Edge provisions into the new District Plan.</p>
<i>Proposed Amenity and Design Provisions – Cost Benefit Analysis (June 2022), prepared for WCC by The Property Group</i>	<p>This report provided a cost benefit analysis of the proposed amenity provisions in the Draft District Plan.</p> <p>The analysis found that in most cases where the amenity provisions have been applied the development remains profitable.</p> <p>The report recommended that the building depth and separation rules be reviewed to assess if the design outcomes sought could be achieved using a different tool.</p>

6.2.1 Analysis of operative District Plan provisions relevant to this topic

The Residential Areas of Wellington City are typically characterised by low-rise single dwelling houses on individual lots. Inner city areas are more intensive and densely populated.

There are three residential areas / zones identified in the operative District Plan:

- Inner Residential Area;
- Outer Residential Area; and
- Medium Density Residential Areas (MDRAs).

Previous plan changes 56 and 72 were focussed on the residential areas.

Plan change 56 introduced new controls to manage infill development. Key changes included a reduction in the bulk and scale of infill housing and a requirement for each dwelling to have an area of outdoor open space attached to it.

Plan change 72 involved a full review of the residential chapters. Key changes introduced through this plan change included two new Medium Density Residential Areas surrounding the Johnsonville and Kilbirnie town centres; and the inclusion of new provisions to recognise the unique character of Wellington’s ‘residential coastal edge’.

The Inner Residential Area includes a high concentration of buildings built at the turn of the last century. The operative plan manages the demolition of these pre-1930s buildings in order to maintain the character of these areas.

Also within the Inner Residential Area is the Oriental Bay Height Area, which provides for medium to high rise residential development in recognition of the close proximity of this area to the central city.

The Medium Density Residential Areas around Johnsonville and Kilbirnie provide for increases in residential density. Rather than seeking to maintain the existing character of these areas, the plan provisions allow for changes to the character and scale of buildings in these areas provided that new development is demonstrated to be of high quality.

The Outer Residential Area contains the suburbs from the Inner Town Belt to the boundary of the Rural Areas. Residential character varies across these suburbs. Houses in the Outer Residential Area are generally larger and located on larger sections compared to the Inner Residential Area.

A consistent policy approach in the operative plan for both the Inner and Outer Residential Areas is to provide for new housing development where it will maintain existing character and the amenity of adjacent properties.

Multi-unit residential development⁶ is subject to a restricted discretionary activity process across all of the residential areas. Design guidelines are also used to assess new multi-unit developments.

There are a number of appendices to the Residential Chapter of the operative plan that have been included over time through various plan changes. Many of these appendices are no longer considered necessary.

The different standards that apply to the residential areas in the operative plan are summarised in the table below.

Standard	Inner Residential	Outer Residential	MDRAs
Minimum Site Dimension	Nil	Nil	Sites must be able to accommodate a circle with a radius of 11 metres.

⁶ In the Inner Residential Area and Medium Density Residential Areas: multi-unit development is defined as two or more household units on a site; in the Outer Residential Area it is three or more household units on a site.

Standard	Inner Residential	Outer Residential	MDRAs
Front Yards	1 metre	3 metres, or 10 metres less half the width of the road, whichever is the lesser	3 metres
Side and Rear Yards	Nil	Nil	Nil
Ground Level Open Space	35m ² per unit (minimum dimension 3 metres)	50m ² per unit (minimum dimension 4 metres)	20m ² per unit (minimum dimension 3 metres)
Site Coverage	50%	40%	50%
Maximum Height	10 metres	8 metres	Kilbirnie – 10 metres Johnsonville – 8 metres
Maximum Height of an Infill Household Unit	Nil	4.5 metres or 6 metres depending on site slope	Nil
Building Recession Planes	2.5m x 45°, 56°, 63° or 71° dependent on boundary bearing	2.5m x 45°	2.5m x 56° or 63° dependent on boundary bearing

6.2.2 Advice received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira

Under Clause 4A of Schedule 1 of the RMA local authorities are required to:

- Provide a copy of any draft policy statement or plan to any iwi authority previously consulted under clause 3 of Schedule 1 prior to notification;
- Allow adequate time and opportunity for those iwi authorities to consider the draft and to supply advice; and
- Have particular regard to any advice received before notifying the plan.

As an extension of this s32(4A) requires evaluation reports prepared in relation to a proposed plan to include a summary of:

- All advice received from iwi authorities concerning the proposal; and
- The response to that advice, including any proposed provisions intended to give effect to the advice.

The District Plan Review has included significant engagement with our mana whenua partners - Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika and Ngāti Toa Rangatira. This has included over 100 hui and wānanga attended by Council officers over the last 12 months. This has provided a much greater understanding of mana whenua values and aspirations as they relate to the PDP.

The PDP elevates the consideration of mana whenua values in resource management processes, including:

- A new Tangata Whenua chapter which provides context and clarity about who mana whenua are and what environmental outcomes they are seeking.
- A new Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter that provides greater protection for sites and areas of significance than the current District Plan.
- Integrating mana whenua values across the remainder of the plan where relevant.

This is consistent with both the City Goal of 'Partnership with mana whenua' in the Spatial Plan; and the recently signed Tākai Here (2022), which is the new partnership agreement between the Council and our mana whenua partners, Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira, Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika and Te Rūnanganui o Te Āti Awa.

A full copy of the advice received is attached as an addendum to the complete suite of Section 32 reports as Addendum A – Advice received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira.

The Draft District Plan versions of the residential chapters were reviewed by mana whenua. No specific advice was received from this review.

6.2.3 Consultation undertaken to date

There have been four rounds of community engagement since 2017 leading to the PDP. These are summarised as follows:

- Our City Tomorrow 2017: the purpose of this engagement was to begin a discussion with the community about what their aspirations are for the City's future given population growth, seismic risks, climate change and sea level rise. From this engagement the following city goals emerged: compact, inclusive and connected, resilient, greener, and vibrant and prosperous. A total of 724 submissions were received through this engagement.
- Growth Scenarios 2019: this City-wide engagement sought the community's views on where and how the City could accommodate 50,000-80,000 more people over the next 30 years, given the city goals. Four scenarios were presented (Inner City, Suburban Centres, and two greenfield scenarios) which represented different forms of development with a range of costs and benefits. A total of 1372 submissions were received on this engagement. This engagement showed strong support for a compact city approach, with future growth concentrated in the City Centre, inner suburbs and in and around suburban centres. There was limited support for further unplanned greenfield development. The Strategy and Policy Committee approved this growth approach in June 2019.
- Draft Spatial Plan 2020: the draft spatial plan engagement was an opportunity for the community to see more detail about the preferred growth scenario and what this could mean for their suburb. The draft spatial plan included a number of key actions that would be needed to realise the preferred scenario, and achieving the city goals. A total of 2900 submissions were received. The Spatial Plan was adopted by Council in June 2021.

- Draft District Plan (DDP): this was consulted on in late 2021 with 1034 submissions received. This included consultation with our two Community Boards, Councils advisory groups (Accessibility, Environmental, and Youth), a significant number of meetings and webinars etc with residents associations, numerous community and advocacy groups. The DDP included all relevant objectives, policies and rules to enable a full assessment by the community of the likely provisions to be included in the PDP.

The following is a summary of the more specific consultation that has been undertaken in respect of the new residential zones in the PDP.

Who	What
Technical Review Panel	<p>A Technical Review Panel (TRP) was appointed by WCC for the purpose of testing and providing feedback on the Draft District Plan chapters. The TRP included a range of design, planning, heritage, architecture and economic experts.</p> <p>The new residential zone chapters were considered by the TRP in April 2021. Overall, the Panel considered that the chapters were clear and fit-for-purpose with some suggested refinements.</p>
Councillor Working Groups	<p>There have been regular workshops with Councillors throughout the course of preparing the Draft and Proposed District Plans. These workshops covered a wide range of topics and allowed Councillors to provide feedback on key policy directions and to input into the development of the Draft and Proposed District Plans.</p> <p>The new residential zones were specifically discussed at these workshops on a number of occasions.</p>
Feedback on Draft District Plan	<p>A detailed report on the submissions received on the Draft District Plan is available here: https://planningforgrowth.wellington.govt.nz/district-plan-review</p> <p>In relation to the residential zones, the above report provides the following overall summary on the feedback received on the residential zones⁷:</p> <p><i>“There were five times more submissions made on the Medium Density Residential Zone subsections than there were on the General Residential Zone subsections. Over a third of the submissions made on subsections within the Medium Density Residential Zone section were of the pro-forma type and urged that a small number of streets within Mt Victoria have their maximum heights reduced from 21m to 11m. Objections to new maximum heights of 21m were made across the subsections about Residential Zones, and were typically justified with commentary around shading, wind tunnelling, loss of character and amenity, and infrastructure pressure anticipated by the influx of new residents.”</i></p>

⁷ The Residential Zones included in the Draft District Plan were General Residential and Medium Density Residential. These have changed in the PDP to Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential.

	A summary of specific feedback on the residential zones received during consultation on the Draft District Plan is contained in Appendix 1 of this report.
--	--

6.3 Summary of Relevant Resource Management Issues

Based on the research, analysis and consultation outlined above, the following issues have been identified:

Issue	Comment	Response
<p>Issue 1:</p> <p>The need to increase housing supply and choice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear evidence that the operative District Plan does not provide sufficient capacity to meet population increases. Changes are therefore needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Medium and High Density Residential Zones, with associated objective, policy and rule frameworks that provide for increased housing supply and different types of housing.
<p>Issue 2:</p> <p>Need to Implement the requirements of the NPS-UD and the RMA (enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These higher order documents require the provision of sufficient housing development capacity to meet community needs. This includes enabling higher densities in identified locations. Wellington City Council as a Tier 1 authority must incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD through an ISPP process that must be notified before 20 August 2022. The Operative District Plan does not give effect to these requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new Medium and High Density Residential Zones include enabling standards to provide for intensification and increased housing opportunities in accordance with the requirements of the NPS-UD. The MDRS are incorporated into the new residential zones. As required by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, the HRZ enables building heights of at least six storeys within a 10 minute walkable catchment of the City Centre Zone, Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre, and the Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations. Building heights of at least six storeys have not been applied around the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre due to natural hazards being a qualifying matter in this area.

Issue	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building heights and densities around centres commensurate with the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. <p>Note: the areas and associated walking catchments identified above, where Policy 3 of the NPS applies, have been determined by the resolutions of the Wellington City Council Planning and Environment Committee made on 23 June 2022. As part of this resolution it was also determined that the Johnsonville rail line was not to be included as a rapid transit line. As a result is this decision the residential areas around the stations on this line were zones MRZ instead of HRZ in the PDP.</p>
<p>Issue 3:</p> <p>Conflicting policy direction in relation to increasing housing and protecting character and amenity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some conflict within the operative District Plan provisions that are supportive for more density and housing, but also seek to maintain and protect character and amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protection of character is now focussed on specifically identified Character Precincts. New direction provided on the need for the efficient use of land for housing and managing adverse effects on amenities. Objectives and policies that recognise the need for changing urban environments instead of character and amenity protection. Clear direction that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the residential zones is expected to change over time. Standards that define an appropriate scale of buildings which recognise the intended future state of the residential zones.

Issue	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above approach is consistent with the NPS-UD which provides clear direction for changing environments and amenity values.
<p>Issue 4:</p> <p>Providing a level of balance between growth and amenity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst the responses to all of the issues identified above signal a shift away from the current approach to character and amenity protection, it is still considered important to provide some balance between growth and retaining a reasonable level of amenity control. This has been a key issue raised in public feedback throughout the course of the Planning for Growth programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt the recommended standards for managing external amenity effects from the 2021 Boffa Miskell report “Planning for Residential Amenity”. Include additional standards that provide for minimum on-site amenity outcomes. Maintain current approach for quality design outcomes to be achieved through design guidance and an urban design assessment as part of the resource consent process.
<p>Issue 5:</p> <p>The need to protect the City’s residential areas from inappropriate use and development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some non-residential activities support the needs of local communities and can contribute to well-functioning urban environments. Incompatible activities can adversely affect the wellbeing of people and communities, and can also undermine the key purpose of the residential zones to provide for housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain a similar approach to the operative District Plan. Provide policy support for those activities that are of an appropriate scale and intensity, and support the health and wellbeing of the community. Include rules which identify appropriate non-residential activities. Manage inappropriate non-residential activities through the resource consent process.

7.0 Scale and significance

Section 32(1)(c) of the RMA requires that this report contains a level of detail that corresponds with the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

The following assessment considers the scale and significance of anticipated effects of the new residential zones in relation to eight factors.

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
Basis for change			✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is part of a full District Plan review. The operative District Plan dates back to 2000. Whilst there have been a number of subsequent plan changes, there is a common view that the current plan is out of date in some respects. More specifically in relation to the residential zones, it has been identified that the operative plan does not provide sufficient housing development capacity, and it does not implement the requirements of the NPS-UD or the RMA (enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. Wellington City Council as a Tier 1 authority must incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD through an Intensification Streamlined Planning Process (ISPP) that must be notified before 20 August 2022.
Addresses a resource management issue			✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear evidence of significant housing supply and affordability issues for Wellington City, and that the operative District Plan does not provide sufficient housing development capacity to meet the projected population growth.
Degree of shift from the status quo		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed provisions for managing land use activities in the new residential zones are comparable to the operative District Plan approach, and they align with the National Planning Standards. The proposed provisions to increase housing supply and provide for a changing urban environment are more significant. However, it must be acknowledged that these changes are mandated by the need for Council to meet its statutory obligations under the NPS-UD and the RMA (enabling

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
				Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act.
Who and how many will be affected/ geographical scale of effect/s			✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This factor scores highly as the residential zones cover a large extent of the urban area of the city; and As shown through the feedback received throughout the Planning for Growth Programme, the issues of housing supply and residential character and amenity effects have a high level of public interest.
Degree of impact on or interest from iwi/ Māori	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft District Plan versions of the residential chapters were reviewed by mana whenua. No specific advice was received from this review. The residential areas contain some cultural sites and areas of significance which are addressed in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter of the PDP.
Timing and duration of effect/s		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MDRS will have immediate legal effect when the PDP is notified. Whilst the proposal represents a high degree of change, the associated impacts will be ongoing rather than immediate given the large number of factors that influence the type of development that takes place across the city as well as when this will occur.
Type of effect/s			✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This factor scores highly as there will be a high degree of impact on the social and economic wellbeing of the community, particularly in relation to housing supply and housing choice. There will also be a range of permanent effects on built form of the residential areas, which will alter the urban environment in these areas over the medium to long term.
Degree of risk and uncertainty		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The degree of risk and uncertainty has been mitigated as far as possible through the extensive public consultation that has been carried out through the last

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
				<p>5 years of engagement leading up to notification of the PDP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is also noted that the new residential zones are giving effect to the statutory direction set by the NPS-UD and the RMA (enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act.

Overall, the scale and significance of the proposed provisions are considered to be medium-high for the following reasons:

- A high-level of change and large area and number of people potentially affected has been identified;
- There is clear evidence to support the need for change;
- There is clear higher order direction of how, when, and where this change needs to be provided for through this District Plan review;
- Effects will be ongoing rather than immediate given the large number of factors that influence the type of development that takes place across the city, and as well as when this will occur; and
- There has been extensive public consultation and awareness of the issues for the residential areas through the last 5 years of engagement leading up to notification of the PDP.

Consequently, a medium-high level evaluation of these provisions has been identified as appropriate for the purposes of this report.

7.1 Quantification of Benefits and Costs

Section 32(2)(b) requires that, where practicable, the benefits and costs of a proposal are to be quantified.

The report “*Proposed Amenity and Design Provisions – Cost Benefit Analysis (June 2022)*” should be read in conjunction with this Section 32 Evaluation.

The above report was commissioned by WCC in order to understand the costs associated with the new residential zone provisions.

The report assessed the new residential zone standards using case studies on a range of sites in terms of direct impact on development costs and what this means for development feasibility.

This report also considered the value increased residential amenity has on a development and its contribution to the revenues that can be generated. It found that a high standard of development with good amenity would also support a higher price point achievable for each apartment.

The assessment demonstrates that providing a residential development with a high level of amenity is not only linked to health and wellbeing benefits for residents directly, it also contributes to broader community, environmental and urban character benefits.

The analysis demonstrates that in most cases where the amenity provisions have been applied the development remains profitable.

The report also highlights a number of challenges facing the construction sector which are outside the scope and control of the District Plan.

In addition to the report referred to above, the later evaluation sections of this report (Sections 11 and 12) also provide a qualitative assessment of the costs and benefits associated with the new residential zone provisions. Overall it is considered the benefits significantly outweigh the costs.

8.0 Zone Framework

The following National Planning Standard zones have been selected in relation to the residential areas covered by this report:

Zone	Reason/s
Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft District Plan included a General Residential Zone. However, this pre-dated the RMA Amendment Act and the need to include the MDRS in all residential zones. • It was not appropriate to retain a General Residential Zone where the Medium Density Residential Standards provided the permitted density and scale of buildings for the zone. • The MRZ is considered to be the most appropriate zoning to cover the majority of the city's urban area as it provides for a wide range of housing types and built forms to meet housing demand. • The MRZ also provides an appropriate distinction from the areas of the city covered by the High Density Residential Zone below, and the increased scale of development that is provided for in that zone.
High Density Residential Zone (HRZ)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HRZ covers areas located near to the City Centre, Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre, and some railway stations. • These areas are subject to the requirements of the NPS-UD to enable buildings heights of up to six storeys. • The HRZ zoning is considered the most appropriate for these areas given the increased scale of development that is anticipated here compared to the MRZ.

9.0 Overview of Proposal/s

The proposed provisions relevant to this topic are set out in detail in the ePlan and should be referenced to in conjunction with this evaluation report.

The proposed provisions are summarized in the table below.

High Density and Medium Density Residential Zones

HRZ Provisions	MRZ Provisions	Comments
<p>Three objectives relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose • Efficient use of land • Healthy, safe and accessible living environments 	<p>Three objectives relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose • Efficient use of land • Healthy, safe and accessible living environments 	<p>These objectives set out the purpose of the zones to provide for predominantly residential activities and housing, and that quality living environments are the outcome sought.</p> <p>Objective 1 in both the HRZ and MRZ is from the RMA Amendment Act and must be included in the PDP.</p> <p>The key point of difference between the two sets of objectives is that HRZ-O2 provides direction that this zone is appropriate for a greater density and scale of development than the MRZ.</p>
<p>Fourteen policies relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabled activities • Housing supply and choice • Housing needs • Medium density residential standards • Developments not meeting permitted activity status • Multi-unit housing • Retirement villages • Residential buildings and structures • Permeable surface • Vegetation and landscaping • Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces • Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation • City Outcomes Contribution • Non-residential activities and buildings 	<p>Fifteen policies relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabled activities • Housing supply and choice • Housing needs • Medium density residential standards • Developments not meeting permitted activity status • Multi-unit housing • Retirement villages • Residential buildings and structures • Permeable surface • Vegetation and landscaping • Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces • Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area • Tapu Te Ranga • Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation • Non-residential activities and buildings 	<p>These policies set out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The range of acceptable activities for this zone. • The scale of development anticipated and provided for in each zone. • A supportive policy approach for multi-unit housing and retirement villages, subject to achieving certain outcomes and adequate infrastructure servicing. • Requiring and encouraging policies for permeable surface, vegetation and landscaping in association with new development. • Considerations for when it may be appropriate to allow non-residential activities and buildings in the zone. <p>Policies 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11 in both the HRZ and MRZ are from the RMA Amendment Act and must be included in the PDP.</p> <p>Policy 2 in the HRZ has been amended slightly from the RMA Amendment Act to include reference to, “...<i>residential buildings of up to 6-storeys in height.</i>” This additional wording is considered appropriate to reflect that this zone is giving effect to the requirements of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The points of difference between the two sets of policies are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the HRZ includes the City Outcomes Contribution policy as this is not applicable in the MRZ. • There are two site specific policies in the MRZ relating to Spenmoor Street and Tapu Te Ranga.

HRZ Provisions	MRZ Provisions	Comments
A rule framework that manages land use activities.	A rule framework that manages land use activities.	<p>The rule framework for managing land use activities is consistent across both zones.</p> <p>The land use activities permitted within the zones, subject to meeting specified conditions, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential activities (up to 3 units on a site); • Home business; • Supported residential care activities; • Boarding houses; • Visitor accommodation; and • Child care services. <p>Other land use activities that may be appropriate in the zones are subject to a restricted discretionary resource consent process. These include multi-unit housing, retirement village, community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, or an education facility.</p> <p>Any other activity is subject to a discretionary activity status.</p>
A rule framework that manages building and structure activities.	A rule framework that manages building and structure activities.	<p>The rule framework for managing building and structure activities is consistent across both zones, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance, repair and demolition is permitted. • Construction of up to three units on a site is permitted subject to compliance with standards. • Additions and alterations are permitted subject to compliance with standards. • Construction of buildings for multi-unit housing or a retirement village are a restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with standards. • Fences and walls are permitted subject to compliance with standards. • Buildings on legal road are a restricted discretionary activity.
A set of standards that address:	A set of standards that address:	In accordance with the requirements of the RMA Amendment Act, both the HRZ and MRZ adopt the MDRS for development of up

HRZ Provisions	MRZ Provisions	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum building height • Height in relation to boundary • Boundary setbacks • Building coverage • Outdoor living space • Outlook space • Windows to Street • Landscape Area • Permeable surface • Height and design of fences and walls <p>Additional standards for multi-unit housing relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum unit size • Outdoor living space • Outlook space • Minimum privacy separation • Maximum building depth • Minimum building separation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum building height • Height in relation to boundary • Boundary setbacks • Building coverage • Outdoor living space • Outlook space • Windows to Street • Landscape Area • Permeable surface • Height and design of fences and walls <p>Additional standards for multi-unit housing relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum unit size • Outdoor living space • Outlook space 	<p>to three residential units, except in relation to front and side yards where there is no requirement.</p> <p>The decision to not include the MDRS front and side standards was made by the Wellington City Council Planning and Environment Committee on 23 June 2022.</p> <p>The RMA Amendment Act allows Council to depart from the MDRS where more enabling standards are proposed, which is the case with front and side yard setbacks not being required.</p> <p>A permeable surface standard has been included in addition to the MDRS for development of up to three residential units. Section 80E(2) of the RMA Amendment Act specially allows for additional provisions relating to stormwater management including permeability.</p> <p>For the HRZ, there are additional height and height in relation to boundary standards that allow for greater building heights under a restricted discretionary consenting process. These additional standards are consistent with the requirements of the NPS-UD to enable building heights of up to 6 storeys in specified areas.</p>

In addition to the above provisions there is also a supporting Residential Design Guide, but the content of this is not addressed in this report.

Oriental Bay Height Precinct (OBHP)

The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is located within the Medium Density Residential Zone. The proposed provisions are largely carried over from the operative District Plan and are summarized in the table below.

OBHP provisions	Comments
One objective stating the purpose of the OBHP.	The purpose of the OBHP is to accommodate medium to high density residential development and a range of compatible non-residential activities at ground floor that maintain or enhance the unique qualities of the Precinct.

One policy setting out the approach for managing development in the OBHP.	The policy seeks to manage development in a manner that recognises the unique characteristics and development potential of the Precinct.
Rules for land use activities	The land use activities rules of the MRZ apply to the OBHP, except that there is no restriction on the number of permitted residential units on a site in the Precinct.
Rules and standards for building activities	<p>The building activities rules and standards for the MRZ do not apply to the OBHP. There are separate rules and standards for this Precinct.</p> <p>Permitted building heights have been set on a site by site basis to maximise residential development potential while at the same time offering protection for the amenity of properties to the rear and the public amenity along Oriental Parade. The heights also serve to protect townscape views of St Gerard's Monastery and the escarpment below.</p>

The Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Precinct are also located within Medium Density Residential Zone. There is a separate Section 32 evaluation report that addresses these Precincts.

10.0 Qualifying Matters

Section 77I of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 states that an authority,

“...may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the following qualifying matters that are present:

(a) a matter of national importance that decision makers are required to recognise and provide for under section 6:

(e) a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure:

(j) any other matter that makes higher density, as provided for by the MDRS or policy 3, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77L is satisfied.”

Within the residential zones of the PDP the following qualifying matters have been applied:

- The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga. This is a matter of natural importance and is therefore specifically provided for as a qualifying matter under (a) above.

- The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. This is a matter of natural importance and is therefore specifically provided for as a qualifying matter under (a) above.
- The management of significant risks from natural hazards. This is a matter of natural importance and is therefore specifically provided for as a qualifying matter under (a) above.
- Controls on development within the Inner Noise Overlay. This is specifically provided for as a qualifying matter under (e) above. The airport is nationally significant infrastructure.
- The provisions associated with the Character Precincts and the Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct. These precincts and the associated provisions are provided for as a qualifying matter in (j) above.

The requirement of Section 77J(3)(b) to provide an assessment of the limiting impact of qualifying matters on development capacity is addressed in a separate report by Urban Edge Planning and Property Economics.

The other requirements of Section 77 are addressed in each of the following Section 32 Evaluation Reports:

- Part 2: Heritage and Cultural Values addresses the qualifying matters relating to heritage areas, buildings and structures, and sites and areas of significance to Māori.
- Part 2: Natural and Coastal Hazards addresses these hazards as qualifying matters in the residential zones.
- Part 2: Noise addresses the controls on development in the Inner Air Noise Overlay as a qualifying matter.
- Part 2: Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct addresses these precincts as a qualifying matter, and also includes the additional evaluation required under Section 77 as these precincts fall under the “any other matter” category of qualifying matters.

NOTE: At date of publication the Council is awaiting a detailed assessment that meets and goes beyond the requirements of 77K and 77Q of the RMA to demonstrate the net effect of each qualifying matter on the provision of development capacity, including those new scheduled items that are not currently scheduled in the operative district plan.

This report will be published approximately August 2022 and made publicly available to support this section 32 report.

11.0 Evaluation of Proposed Objectives

Section 32(1)(a) of the RMA requires that the evaluation report examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

An examination of the proposed objectives is included below, with the relative extent of their appropriateness based on an assessment against the following criteria:

1. Relevance (i.e. Is the objective related to addressing resource management issues and will it achieve one or more aspects of the purpose and principles of the RMA?)
2. Usefulness (i.e. Will the objective guide decision-making? Does it meet sound principles for writing objectives (i.e. does it clearly state the anticipated outcome?)
3. Reasonableness (i.e. What is the extent of the regulatory impact imposed on individuals, businesses or the wider community? Is it consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes?)
4. Achievability (i.e. Can the objective be achieved with tools and resources available, or likely to be available, to the Council?)

While not specifically required under Section 32, it is appropriate to also consider alternative objectives to those currently included in the Proposed District Plan, so as to ensure that the proposed objective are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

For the purposes of this evaluation, two sets of potential objectives have been considered as follows:

1. The proposed objectives; and
2. The current most relevant objectives - the status quo.

11.1 Evaluation of HRZ and MRZ Objectives 1, 2 and 3

Proposed Objectives – Purpose

HRZ-O1: The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:

- 1. Housing needs and demand; and*
- 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.*

MRZ-O1: The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:

- 1. Housing needs and demand; and*
- 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3 storey buildings.*

Proposed Objectives – Efficient use of land

HRZ-O2: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that:

- 1. Increases housing supply and choice;*
- 2. May be of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and*

3. *Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.*

MRZ-O2: *Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that:*

1. *Increases housing supply and choice; and*
2. *Contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment.*

Proposed Objectives – Healthy, safe and accessible living environments

HRZ-O3: *The High Density Residential Zone provides healthy, safe and accessible living environments with attractive and safe streets.*

MRZ-O3: *The Medium Density Residential Zone provides healthy, safe and accessible living environments with attractive and safe streets.*

General intent

- The intent of these objectives is to clearly identify the primary purpose of the residential zones to provide housing.
- The efficient use of land within the residential zones is identified as an outcome sought by the objectives in order to support the strategic objectives of maintaining a compact urban form and providing new housing to help address the City’s housing needs.
- HRZ-O2 provides clear direction that a greater density and scale of development is appropriate in the HRZ compared to the MRZ.
- In addition the objectives seek new development to deliver positive urban design outcomes and living environments.

Status quo: objectives from operative District Plan

Objective 4.21 – Containment and Intensification: *To enhance the City’s natural containment, accessibility and residential amenity by promoting the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources in Residential Areas.*

Objective 4.2.3 – Urban Form: *Ensure that new development within Residential Areas is of a character and scale that is appropriate for the area and neighbourhood in which it is located.*

Objective 4.2.4 – Residential Amenity: *Ensure that all residential properties have access to reasonable levels of residential amenity.*

	Proposed objectives	Status quo
Addresses a relevant resource management issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence that the operative District Plan does not provide sufficient housing capacity to meet population increases. • The proposed objectives address this issue by providing clear direction that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives in the operative District Plan do reference the efficient use of land. • However, the objectives lack clear direction on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the need to increase housing supply; and - in relation to stating a direction on the intended

	<p>intensification and change will need to occur within the residential zones to increase housing supply and provide for different types of housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed objectives achieve the purpose of the Act by supporting people and communities to meet their housing needs, which is directly related to supporting the social, economic, cultural wellbeing and health and safety of communities, as well as helping to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. 	<p>future state and change required for the residential areas to increase housing supply.</p>
<p>Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 RMA</p>	<p>The proposed objectives will assist the Council to undertake its functions under s31 of the RMA, particularly in relation to s31(aa) which requires Council to have objectives in place to ensure that there is sufficient housing development capacity to meet the expected demands of the district.</p>	<p>The current objectives lack the clarity and direction required to fully support the requirements of s31.</p>
<p>Gives effect to higher level documents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed objectives give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD. Objectives HRZ-O1 and MRZ-O1 must be included in the PDP in accordance with Schedule 3A of the RMA Amendment Act 2021. The proposed objectives also give effect to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City; and to Objectives 22 and Policies 31 and 55 of the RPS. 	<p>The current objectives do not implement the requirements of the NPS-UD to provide for higher density housing in appropriate locations in both the MRZ and the HRZ. They also do not give effect to the Councils adopted Spatial Plan.</p>
<p>Guides decision-making</p>	<p>The proposed objectives in conjunction with the proposed policies will guide decision making when considering a resource consent application under s104. As set out above, they provide</p>	<p>The current objectives are used to guide decision-making. However, as identified in the resource management issues for this topic, they provide conflicting direction in</p>

	clear direction regarding the purpose and intended outcomes for the residential zones.	relation to increasing housing and protecting character and amenity.
Meets best practice for objectives	The proposed objectives use plain english and clearly state the purpose and outcomes sought for the residential zones, which aligns with current best practice.	The current objectives provide a conflicting direction and do not articulate the zone purpose or a clear future state.
Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community/parts of the community	The proposed objectives are clear and enabling of change to help meet housing needs. They are unlikely to result in any significant additional compliance costs to achieve the outcomes sought.	The existing objectives do not appear to have resulted in significant compliance costs being incurred by landowners and developers.
Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk	The proposed objectives provide greater clarity of intent and certainty regarding the outcomes sought in the new residential zones.	There is a lesser degree of clarity and certainty around the existing objectives.
Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes	No specific tāngata whenua or community outcomes have been identified.	No specific tāngata whenua or community outcomes have been identified.
Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources	The proposed objectives are realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources.	The status quo objectives are currently being implemented within the Council's powers, skills and resources.
Summary		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence that the operative District Plan does not provide sufficient housing capacity to meet population increases. The current objectives lack direction on the need to increase housing supply and they do not give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD to provide for higher density housing in appropriate locations, or to the Councils adopted Spatial Plan. • Maintaining the status quo is therefore not considered to be a viable option. • The proposed objectives for the HRZ and MRZ provide a consistent and clear direction for the outcomes sought in the new residential zones. • The above analysis demonstrates that the proposed objectives will achieve the purpose of the Act and the Council's functions under s31 RMA; they give effect to the higher-level planning instruments; provide greater certainty for decision-makers and plan users; align with best practice guidance; and they are not expected to result in significant additional administrative or compliance costs. 		

11.2 Evaluation of MRZ Oriental Bay Height Precinct – Objective 1

Proposed Objective – Purpose

MRZ-PREC03-O1: *The Oriental Bay Height Precinct accommodates medium to high density residential development and a range of compatible non-residential activities at ground floor that maintain or enhance the unique qualities of the Precinct.*

General intent

The intent of this objective is to identify that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct (OBHP) has unique qualities and development opportunities that are distinct from the other residential areas of the city, and that a more specific approach is required to address the outcomes sought for this area. The provisions relating to the OBHP are largely carried over from the operative District Plan.

Status quo from the operative District Plan

The operative District Plan does not contain a specific objective for the Oriental Bay Height Area. There are specific policies and rules in the operative plan that relate to the Oriental Bay Height Area. These were determined through the 1998 Environment Court decision W73/98.

This Environment Court decision confirmed that, *“Oriental Bay is a unique area of Wellington with a special character and high land and amenity value. The public significance of the area, as well as the special character of its residential environment needs very special consideration”.*

	Proposed objective	Status quo
Addresses a relevant resource management issue	The 1998 Environment Court decision confirms that a more specific approach is required to address the outcomes sought for this area. The proposed objective addresses this issue.	The operative plan does not include a specific objective for this area.
Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 RMA	The proposed objective will assist the Council to undertake its functions under s31 of the RMA. In particular, s31(a) requires provisions that achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land. Section s31(aa) also requires Council to have objectives in place to ensure that there is sufficient housing development capacity to meet the expected demands of the district.	The absence of an objective results in a lack of clarity and direction required to fully support the requirements of s31.
Gives effect to higher level documents	The proposed objective is consistent with the NPS-UD as it identifies the Oriental Bay Height Precinct as being appropriate for medium to high density residential development.	The absence of an objective for Oriental Bay Height Area is not considered to implement the requirements of the NPS-UD to provide for higher density housing in appropriate locations. It is also inconsistent with the National Planning Standards that support areas with different constraints, qualities or outcomes to be managed through a precinct approach.

Guides decision-making	The proposed objective in conjunction with the proposed provisions for the OBHP will provide direction for decision making when considering a resource consent application under s104.	The absence of a specific objective for the Oriental Bay Height Area does not appear to have hindered the determination of resource consents under the operative District Plan. However, the inclusion of the proposed objective in the PDP will assist future decision-making for this area.
Meets best practice for objectives	The proposed objective uses plain english and clearly states the outcomes sought for the precinct, which aligns with current best practice.	Not able to be assessed as there is no operative plan objective for this area.
Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community/parts of the community	No additional or significant costs are expected given that the provisions relating to the OBHP are largely being retained and carried over from the operative District Plan, with the addition of a new, clear and specific objective that will assist future decision-making for this area.	Not able to be assessed as there is no operative plan objective for this area.
Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk	As above, the proposed approach is consistent with the current and well-established approach for this area and therefore the levels of uncertainty and risk are minimal.	Not able to be assessed as there is no operative plan objective for this area.
Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes	No specific tāngata whenua or community outcomes have been identified.	No specific tāngata whenua or community outcomes have been identified.
Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources	The proposed objective can be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources.	The provisions of the operative plan for this area are currently being implemented within the Council's powers, skills and resources notwithstanding the absence of a specific objective for the area.
Summary		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Court has determined that the Oriental Bay area is unique with special character and requires a special approach. The use of a precinct to manage this area is therefore appropriate and consistent with the National Planning Standards. • The absence of a specific objective in the operative plan does not address the identified resource management issue to provide clear direction on the need for increased housing in the residential areas of the city. • The proposed objective addresses this issue and gives effect to the NPS-UD as it identifies the Oriental Bay Height Precinct as being appropriate for medium to high density residential development. 		

- The above analysis demonstrates that the proposed objective will achieve the purpose of the Act and the Council's functions under s31 RMA; gives effect to the higher-level planning instruments; aligns with best practice guidance; and it will not result in additional administrative or compliance costs, or increase uncertainty and risk.

12.0 Evaluation of Proposed Policies, Rules and Standards

This section of the report evaluates the proposed policies, rules and standards as they relate to the associated objectives.

For the purpose of this evaluation, the Council has considered the following potential options:

1. The proposed provisions;
2. The status quo of maintaining the operative District Plan approach; and
3. A reasonable alternative proposal involving a more permissive approach where all residential activities are permitted in the HRZ and the MRZ if they comply with the relevant bulk and location standards, and with more limited matters to consider where standards are breached. The key differences with this approach compared to the proposed provisions are that:
 - There would be no limit on the number of permitted residential units on a site.
 - Related to the above, there would be no distinction made for multi-unit residential developments, and as such there would be no requirement for a qualitative urban design assessment against the Residential Design Guide.
 - All breaches of bulk and location standards would be assessed as restricted discretionary activities with the matters of discretion limited to dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. There would be no consideration of streetscape or visual amenity effects, or on the level of on site amenity provided by new development.
 - For the HRZ, the bulk and location standards would allow buildings and structures up to 21m as a permitted activity where all standards are met (as opposed to the proposed provisions which assess this scale of development as a restricted discretionary activity with a qualitative urban design assessment against the Residential Design Guide required).

For each potential approach an evaluation has been undertaken relating to the costs, benefits and the certainty and sufficiency of information in order to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the approach, and whether it is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives. This evaluation is contained in the following tables.

This analysis relates to all proposed objectives of the HRZ and MRZ as follows:

- Purpose objectives HRZ-O1, MRZ-O1 and MRZ-PREC-O1
- Efficient use of land objectives HRZ-O2 and MRZ-O2
- Healthy, safe and accessible living environments objectives HRZ-O3 and MRZ-O3

Option 1: Proposed approach (recommended)	Costs	Benefits	Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions
---	-------	----------	--

<p><u>Policies</u></p> <p>Thirteen consistent policies for the HRZ and MRZ that seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide direction on the range of appropriate activities for the zones, and restrict inappropriate non-residential activities and buildings • Enable a variety housing types and densities to increase housing supply and choice and meet housing needs • Provide for a range of residential buildings and structures, including additions and alterations • Apply the medium density residential standards in the zones, except where there is a relevant qualifying matter • Provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status • Provide for multi-unit housing and retirement villages subject to consideration of certain matters • Require a minimum level of permeable surface to be provided in new development • Encourage the retention and / or replacement of vegetation and landscaping in new development • Encourage new development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces • Encourage the provision of community gardens, small-scale urban agriculture and waste minimisation <p>For the HRZ there is an additional policy relating to the application of the City Outcomes Contribution in this zone.</p> <p>For the MRZ there are two site specific policies as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MRZ-P12 relating to the Spenmoor Street Area and requiring assessment of roading capacity for new multi-unit development, due to the know roading constraints in this area • MRZ-P13 relating to Tapu Te Ranga and consideration of the geo-technical and contamination issues known to be present at this site <p><u>Rules</u></p>	<p>Environmental and social</p> <p>The proposed approach is more enabling for new housing development compared to the operative District Plan.</p> <p>This is likely to result in changes to the form and appearance of the residential areas of the city, noting however that this change will happen over time and is influenced by a number of factors in addition to the planning framework.</p> <p>An associated change in amenity levels is also anticipated, which may be seen by many as an environmental or a social cost, as indicated by feedback received on the Draft District Plan.</p> <p>However in assessing these costs it must be recognised that the level of change in the proposed approach is largely driven and mandated by national direction.</p> <p>Policy 6 of the NPS-UD states that, “...the planned urban built form in those RMA planning documents may involve significant changes to an area, and those changes:</p> <p>(i) may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by other people, communities, and future generations, including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types;</p> <p>(ii) and (i) are not, of themselves, an adverse effect”</p> <p>Both the HRZ and MRZ incorporate the MDRS as required by the RMA Amendment Act, and the HRZ directly implements Policy 3 of the NPS-UD by enabling building heights of up to 6 storeys in specified areas.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst there may be perceived environmental and social costs associated with the proposed approach, these are largely negated by the</p>	<p>Environmental and social</p> <p>The policy direction provided in the proposed approach aligns with all higher order direction in the RMA, RPS, NPS-UDP and the Council's adopted Spatial Plan.</p> <p>There are clear environmental and social benefits from increasing housing supply and choice to meet existing and future housing demand.</p> <p>Greater flexibility and choice in housing will also better meet people's needs and lifestyle preferences.</p> <p>There are wider environmental benefits from the new growth approach and associated new provisions e.g. a growth approach that supports carbon reduction, and new standards relating to permeability, roofing materials and stormwater neutrality that will support better stormwater management and water quality outcomes.</p> <p>Greenfield development is still needed and provided for in the Future Urban Zones in the PDP to help meet housing needs. The proposed approach will help reduce the need for future further reliance on greenfield land for housing.</p> <p>Alongside the more enabling provisions to increase housing in the proposed approach, it is also important to acknowledge the objectives that seek positive change and outcomes relating to healthy, safe and accessible living environments with attractive and safe streets.</p> <p>The proposed approach is based on the 2021 study by Boffa Miskell that assessed a range of measures that can be used to achieve a balance between amenity and increased density. The report provided recommendations on a suite of controls and standards to achieve this balance, and these have largely been adopted in the proposed approach.</p> <p>In relation to land use, the proposed approach is similar to the operative District Plan, whereby appropriate activities are provided for and other activities are managed through resource consent process. This approach supports the</p>	<p>It is considered that there is certain and sufficient information to support the proposed approach.</p> <p>There is compelling evidence regarding the current housing supply and affordability issues, and in relation to the anticipated population growth which will exacerbate these issues if action is not taken.</p> <p>There is also clear national direction that necessitates change, and many of the changes for the new residential zones are mandated through the RMA, the National Planning Standards and the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The provisions have also been informed by a wide range of reports and studies as set out in Section 5 of this report.</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>A consistent rule framework for managing land use and building activities across both the residential zones, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitted activities anticipated in the zones subject to meeting specified conditions • Provision for other land use activities that may be appropriate in the zones subject to a restricted discretionary resource consent process • Repair, maintenance and demolition of buildings are permitted • Additions, alterations and new buildings are permitted subject to compliance with standards • Construction of buildings for multi-unit housing or a retirement village are a restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with standards <p><u>Standards</u></p> <p>A consistent set of standards for the residential zones that address: maximum height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks, coverage, outdoor living space, outlook space, windows to street, landscaped area, permeable surface, and fencing.</p> <p>Additional standards for multi-unit housing relating to minimum unit size, outdoor living space and outlook space.</p> <p>For the HRZ only, there are additional height and height in relation to boundary standards that allow for greater building heights under a restricted discretionary consenting process. This gives effect to the requirements of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.</p> <p><u>Oriental Bay Height Precinct</u></p> <p>Application of a precinct approach with associated provisions to recognize the unique characteristics and development potential of this area.</p> <p>The land use activities rules of the MRZ apply to the OBHP, except that there is no restriction on the number of permitted residential units on a site.</p> <p>The building activities rules and standards for the MRZ do not apply to the OBHP. There are separate rules and standards for this precinct.</p> <p>Permitted building heights have been set on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>requirements placed on Council to meet the higher order direction to provide for increased density and changing urban environments, particularly for Wellington City as a tier 1 authority.</p> <p>Economic</p> <p>There are a mix of current and new bulk and location standards included in the proposed approach. These will impact on development yield and therefore on the economic viability of new development.</p> <p>The proposed provisions have been tested in the 2022 cost benefit report by The Property Group.</p> <p>This report assessed the new residential zone standards using case studies on a range of sites in terms of direct impact on development costs and what this means for development feasibility.</p> <p>This report also considered the value increased residential amenity has on a development and its contribution to the revenues that can be generated. It found that a high standard of development with good amenity would also support a higher price point for each apartment.</p> <p>The assessment demonstrates that providing a residential development with a high level of amenity is not only linked to health and wellbeing benefits for residents directly, it also contributes to broader community, environmental and urban character benefits.</p> <p>The analysis demonstrates that in most cases where the amenity provisions have been applied the development remains profitable.</p> <p>Also in relation to costs, it is acknowledged that under the proposed approach a number of activities and developments will still require resource consent with associated costs. However, this is not considered to be a significant change from the current approach under the operative District Plan.</p> <p>Cultural</p> <p>No direct or indirect costs have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the PDP.</p>	<p>needs of local communities and will contribute to achieving well-functioning urban environments.</p> <p>Economic</p> <p>Increasing housing supply will help to improve housing choice and affordability.</p> <p>Increased house building activity and supply of housing will support employment activities in construction and associated support services, as well as those engaged in real estate, development finance and other activities associated with the construction, buying and selling of property.</p> <p>Increased densities in appropriate location such as around centres will also help support business and economic growth.</p> <p>Cultural</p> <p>No direct or indirect benefits have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the PDP.</p> <p>Oriental Bay Height Precinct</p> <p>The proposed approach for the Oriental Bay Height Precinct is largely consistent with the operative District Plan.</p> <p>This approach was established through an Environment Court process and is therefore well-tested.</p> <p>Retaining the status quo for this area was supported in submissions on the Draft District Plan.</p> <p>The proposed approach is also enabling of medium to high density residential development in the precinct and is therefore consistent with the NPS-UD.</p>	
--	---	---	--

<p>Overall evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>The proposed approach is considered to be most appropriate for achieving the proposed objectives in relation to both effectiveness and efficiency for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides a clear and integrated framework to achieve the outcomes sought for the new residential zones. • In particular, it increases opportunities for housing alongside provisions to achieve quality living environments and well-functioning urban environments. • It is based on sound evidence, and has been developed through an extensive consultation process. • It effectively implements all higher order direction. • The approach is efficient in terms of the level of certainty provided to landowners and plan users generally. • The costs are considered negligible compared to the high level of benefits. • The benefits of the proposed approach are considered to significantly outweigh the costs. 		
<p>Option 2: Alternative more permissive approach</p>	<p>Costs</p>	<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions</p>
<p>This option involves an alternative more permissive approach compared to Option 1, with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No limit on the number of permitted residential units on a site. • No requirement for a qualitative urban design assessment against the Residential Design Guide for multi-unit housing. • All breaches of standards would be assessed as restricted discretionary activities with the matters of discretion limited to dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. • No consideration of streetscape or visual amenity effects, or on the level of on site amenity provided by new development. • For the HRZ, the standards would allow buildings and structures up to 21m as a permitted activity where all standards are met. 	<p>Environmental and social</p> <p>The alternative approach is very enabling in relation to providing for new housing development.</p> <p>However, it fails to address the community concerns relating to managing the scale and effects of change.</p> <p>It also fails to address the objectives for the residential zones that seek positive change and outcomes relating to healthy, safe and accessible living environments with attractive and safe streets.</p> <p>The reliance on bulk and location standards in this option, without any qualitative urban design controls, is considered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not effectively manage the transition to a more intensive high-density urban living environment. • Result in developments that have little regard to their context and surroundings. • Result on poor environmental outcomes. • Result on poor on-site amenity and greater amenity impacts to surrounding residential properties. • Not provide for the health and wellbeing of people in the new residential zones. <p>Economic and cultural</p> <p>No direct or indirect economic or cultural costs have been identified for this option.</p>	<p>Economic</p> <p>This approach would provide for more permissive development standards and therefore increased development rights.</p> <p>It is also likely to involve more permitted development and therefore less consenting and compliance costs.</p> <p>However, as set out in the 2022 cost benefit report by The Property Group, increased yield does not necessitate increased profit and feasibility. The report found that a high standard of development with good amenity would also support a higher price point achievable for each apartment.</p> <p>Environmental, social and cultural</p> <p>No direct or indirect environment, social or cultural benefits have been identified for this option.</p>	<p>There is insufficient information to support this approach.</p> <p>The use of design guides is well-established part of the operative District Plan, and the evidence base and consultation carried out does not support the need to move away from this approach.</p> <p>There is also a lack of testing and evidence that supports a conclusion that the alternative approach would achieve the outcomes sought for the new residential zones.</p>

<p>Overall evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>This is not considered to be the most appropriate approach for achieving the residential zone objectives. Whilst it may result in some increased development capacity and some reduced consenting and compliance costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not considered an efficient method of meeting the proposed objectives given the relative costs versus benefits outlined above. • It is not considered an effective method of meeting the proposed objectives given the lack of testing, evidence and consultation feedback that supports the need for this approach. • It is considered to be of limited effectiveness in achieving the zone outcomes for positive change and urban design outcomes, as well resulting in uncertain amenity outcomes. • It represents greater uncertainty for communities in relation to the degree and effects of change compared to the preferred option. 		
<p>Option 3: Status Quo – maintain the operative District Plan approach</p>	<p>Costs</p>	<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions</p>
<p>Maintain the three current residential areas / zones and associated provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inner Residential Area; • Outer Residential Area; • Medium Density Residential Areas (MDRAs). <p>The different standards that apply in the above residential areas are set out in Section 5 of this report.</p>	<p>Maintaining the current approach would not address housing needs and would worsen the current housing affordability issues.</p> <p>Failing to address the lack of housing supply to meet current and future needs will have wider economic implications for the city.</p> <p>Maintaining the status quo is in direct conflict to the government direction which requires Wellington City Council as a tier 1 local authority to provide for well-functioning urban environments that have sufficient development capacity to meet the different needs of its people and communities.</p> <p>It is also contrary to the direction set by the Council in its adopted Spatial Plan.</p>	<p>There are considered to be limited benefits from maintaining the status quo approach.</p> <p>Provisions based on the operative District Plan would offer familiarity and be well understood. However, they would be open to significant challenge as being out of date and inconsistent with the higher order direction.</p> <p>Maintaining the current bulk, location, amenity and character controls would address some of the community concerns regarding the scale and effects of change proposed in the preferred option. However, this approach would not give effect to the higher order direction, and it would not implement the objectives for these zones.</p>	<p>The operative provisions have largely been in place since 2000, with various piecemeal amendments made through a number of plan changes since this time.</p> <p>There is clear information and evidence that confirms that the current provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - are out of date and not fit for purpose in some respects; - do not give effect to higher order direction; and - do not provide sufficient development capacity. <p>The key risks of maintaining the current approach is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it will worsen the city's housing supply and affordability issues; and - is likely be found to be an inappropriate and unsupportable approach to meeting Councils higher order statutory requirements.
<p>Overall evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>Maintaining the status quo is considered to be the least appropriate approach to achieve the objectives of the new residential zones, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear information and evidence that confirms that the current provisions are out of date and not fit for purpose in some respects, and do not implement higher order direction. 		

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The status quo approach does not enable the efficient and effective use of residential areas as a physical resource.• It is not efficient or effective in providing the direction and planning framework required to increase housing supply and facilitate positive urban change.• Maintaining the current approach would worsen the current housing supply and affordability issues, and in doing so it fails to meet the housing needs of current and future generations. |
|--|--|

13.0 Conclusion

This evaluation has been undertaken in accordance with section 32 of the RMA in order to identify the need, benefits and costs and the appropriateness of the proposal having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency relative to other means in achieving the purpose of the RMA.

The evaluation demonstrates that this proposal is the most appropriate option as:

- It is based on sound evidence, and has been developed through an extensive consultation process.
- Aligns with the National Planning Standards.
- Gives effect to all relevant higher order direction and requirements.
- Implements the directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City.
- The objectives and policies provide certainty and clear direction regarding the purpose, character and level of amenity anticipated within the zones, supported by a framework of rules and standards that align with the built development and amenity outcomes sought.
- The benefits of the proposed approach significantly outweigh the costs.

Appendix 1: Summary of Feedback on Draft District P

Appendix 1: Summary of Feedback on Draft District Plan 2021

Summary of General Residential Zone (GRZ) Submissions

Note 1: The Residential Zones included in the Draft District Plan were General Residential and Medium Density Residential. These have changed in the PDP to Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential.

Note 2: This summary was prepared in advance of the WCC Planning & Environment Committee on 23 June 2022. It does not include the decisions and amendments that were made by the Committee on 23 June 2022.

Submitter No.	Submitter	Submission Point No.	Summary	Notes	Does this warrant a change to the chapter?		What change is needed and why?
					Any changes sought by this submission point?	Does this warrant a change?	
1131	Waka Kotahi (WK)	1131.2	Waka Kotahi would prefer that the area relevant to reverse sensitivity provisions, and the need to seek affected party approval were more prominent, to prevent applicants from overlooking these provisions at an early stage.		Yes		No change. The reverse sensitivity provisions apply across multiple zones and areas and sit in the noise chapter. The Eplan should highlight these and it is not considered necessary to have multiple references throughout the plan to these reverse sensitivity provisions.
	WK	1131.2	Waka Kotahi therefore requests that WCC consider applying to the Environment Court (under s86D) for those provisions to have immediate legal effect upon notification.		No		No changes required to the Residential Zones. Submission point to be considered by Noise Chapter lead.
	WK & MoE	1131.3 1129.4	There are two definitions of <i>Education Facility</i> and <i>Educational Facility</i> . WK preference is for the definition of "Educational facility" to be used throughout Plan. MoE supports the <i>Educational Facility</i> and <i>Childcare Services</i> definitions in the DDP and seeks these to be retained as drafted.		Yes		Resolved - now just have one definition.
	WK	1131.15	Waka Kotahi would like to see greater provision for intensification, including in the General Residential Zone.		Yes		This submission will be addressed through the new approach of having two residential zones – medium and high density.
1129	Ministry of Education (MoE)	1129.3	The Ministry supports the activity status of RD for Educational Facilities in these zones and considers the matters of discretion for Educational Facilities to be expected and reasonable.		No		
	MoE	1129.8	MoE supports GRZ policies and matters of discretion as drafted.		No		

	Kāinga Ora (KO)		KO opposes Residential Coastal Edge Precinct.		Yes		Precinct to be removed.
	KO		KO seeks changes to wording of GRZ-P1, P2 and P5.		Yes		These policies have been amended as a result of GRZ being deleted.
	KO		KO seeks deletion of minimum unit sizes for 2 + bedrooms units		Yes		Minimum unit sizes have been retained across the plan.
	KO		KO opposes minimum daylight access standard – GRZ-S14		Yes		Agree this should be deleted based on KO submission and also taking into account new MDRS.
1121	Summerset MetlifeCare	1121.5	GRZ-P5 - Summerset seeks deletion of matter relating to the location of the development to good access to public and / or active transport networks. MetlifeCare seeks same change to GRZ-P5.5 to delete reference to “good access to public and/or active transport networks”		Yes		Agree with this change.
1113	Oranga Tamariki	1113.8	Oranga Tamariki support the Permitted activity status for supported residential care activities. It provides flexibility for Oranga Tamariki to establish homes (up to 10 residents) in residential zones. Residential zones are considered an appropriate zone for Oranga Tamariki homes. They also support RD status and public notification preclusion for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents		No		
1056	VicLabour	1056.11	We also believe that GRZ-P3.3 should not be excessively restrictive when the vegetation is not of particular significance (e.g. is not native bush) and/or could be compensated with plantation/improvement elsewhere.		Yes		This point has been removed and replaced with reference to the specific vegetation and landscaping policy
	VicLabour	1056.11	GRZP6.2 should be paired back/clarified to ensure that arbitrary ‘attractive street’ standards do not prevent innovative or modest housing developments. Liveability and affordability, as overarching goals, should trump aesthetic street value.		Yes		No change – the reference to attractive streets is part of the new policy wording that must be included from the RMA Amend Act.
1041	Graham Spargo	1041.1	Does not support front or side yard exemptions for accessory buildings		Yes		These exemptions have been removed as a result of incorporating the MDRS.
973	Coral Aldridge		The cumulative impacts of the residential coastal edge (significant building and structure controls, particularly above 13masl), with the SNA (significant vegetation controls) prohibits any reasonable use of this land - despite significant attribution to property value and rates apportionment.		Yes		Residential coastal edge not retained.

	General		Opposition to residential zoning densities, increased height limits and number of dwellings anticipated under the proposed rules.		Yes		Plan needs to give effect to densities, heights and number of dwellings set by the NPS-UD and MDRS.
916	MetlifeCare	916.6	MRZ-R14 As drafted any additions and alterations to a retirement village would require a resource consent. This is overly restrictive, particularly when Metlifecare seek to undertake a minor alteration to a village, i.e. adding a ramp for accessibility, installing a covered deck, etc. Request that alterations and additions that comply with standards S1-S7, S9-S11 and S13-14 be a permitted activity.		Yes		Additions and alterations to retirement village and multi-unit housing is now provided for as a permitted activity.
	MetlifeCare	916.7	Request Karori be amended to Medium Density Residential Zone		Yes		Yes this will need to happen as a result of new MDRS
744	Paul M Blaschke	744.16	GRZ-P10 should include mention of community gardens.		Yes		Agree

Summary of Medium Residential Zone (MRZ) Submissions

Note: The Residential Zones included in the Draft District Plan were General Residential and Medium Density Residential. These have changed in the PDP to Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential.

Does this warrant a change to the chapter?		Yes
		No

Submitter No.	Submitter	Submission Point No.	Summary	Any change sought by this point?	Does this warrant a change to chapter?	What change is needed and why?
1129	Ministry of Education (MoE)	1129.9	MoE supports MRZ policies; and supports the activity status of Restricted Discretionary for Educational Facilities; and considers the matters of discretion for Educational Facilities to be appropriate.	No		Submission in support – no changes needed.
	Kāianga Ora (KO)		KO seeks new High Density Residential Zone in place of current MRZ; also seeks 15-minute walking catchment from City Centre extended to 20-30 minutes; and seeks higher density provided for within 10 minute walkable catchment of planned rapid transit routes such as Island Bay, Miramar, and Seatoun; also seeks parts of Strathmore Park to be re-zoned from GZ to MRZ.	Yes		This submission will be addressed to some extent through the new approach of having two residential zones (medium and high density), and also through incorporating the new MDRS into the PDP. With these changes it is not considered necessary to further extend the walking catchment around the City Centre. The submission point relating to the rapid transit routes will need to be addressed later in the plan review process when more there is more certainty on the route and stop locations.
	KO		KO opposed to COC for over-height development. Instead the basis of assessment should be on effects, which can include positive effects.	Yes		The CoC policy applies across zones and therefore any changes to it should be discussed at a more strategic level and not be determined on a zone by zone basis.
	KO		KO opposes defining multi-unit housing and seeks deletion of any references to it.	Yes		The definition will be amended to reflect the new MDRS, but it will not be removed as the use of design guides needs to be linked to a definition of multi-unit housing.
	KO		KO seeks papakāinga housing to be a permitted activity across the District Plan.	No		No change considered necessary as Papakaianga housing will fall under the definition of a permitted residential activity.

	KO		KO seeks the introduction of a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities.	Yes		No change - the blanket approach suggested by KO is not considered appropriate, however there will need to be some changes to the notification clauses resulting from the recent RMA housing amendments.
1121	Summerset	1121.3	MRZR7 provides for a retirement village as a restricted discretionary activity in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Summerset supports this activity status, and also supports the matters of discretion.	No		
	Summerset	1121.2	The matters of discretion refer back to two policies –MRZ-P5 and MRZ-P8. However, the matters of discretion in MRZ-P8 are already listed in MRZP5. Accordingly, Summerset seeks that reference to MRZ-P8 be removed.	Yes		Agree and redrafted.
	Summerset	112.1	The notification statement for Rule MRZ-R7 precludes a retirement village from being publicly notified, but not from being limited notified. Given that this rule only provides for a retirement village as a land use activity and the construction of a village is controlled by a separate rule, Summerset seeks that the notification statement be amended to also preclude limited notification.	Yes		No change considered necessary and range of activities associated with a retirement village warrants retention of ltd
	Summerset	1121.4	Summerset does not support the use of "only allow" in Policy MRZ-P5, and considers that this wording is contrary to the introductory statement to the zone chapter, which states "multi-unit housing and retirement villages are subject to enabling standards that provide for the increased density and scale of development that is anticipated in this Zone". Summerset seeks that Policy MRZ-P5 be amended to be "Provide for retirement villages.....where it can be demonstrated that the development...	Yes		Agree with this change and redrafted.
	Summerset	1121.4	Summerset seeks other changes to wording of MRZ-P5 as follows: Only allow Provide for retirement villages that where it can be demonstrated that the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; 3. Retains existing prominent vegetation where practicable and appropriate and minimises hard surfacing or mitigates the removal of vegetation and extent of hard surfacing with new landscaping of equal or better quality; 4. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; 5. Is Adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 6. Is Are of an intensity, scale and design compatible with the built environment anticipated for the Medium Density Residential Zone that maintains the amenity of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. 	Yes		Agree with change to <i>provide for</i> Do not agree with deleting reference to the Design Guide. Changes to point 6 not necessary as covered by residential buildings and structures policy.
	Summerset	1121.6	Summerset seeks exemptions for retirement villages in relation to S11, S13 & S14.	Yes		Agree with S13 and S14 but not S11.

823	Body Corporate 459270	823.1	Seeks 33 Hiropi St to be rezoned to 21m height.	Yes	No change as not appropriate to re-zone a single site, but this area will need to be looked at again when LGWM route is confirmed.
571	ERG	571.96	Suggest change to wording of MRZ-O2 to Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that increases housing supply and choice, and the new residential development contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment.	Yes	Agree
1116	Heritage NZ	1116.14	Amend MRZ-S9: For any site adjoining a site within the General Residential Zone, Character Precincts, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct, a heritage building identified in SCHED1 or heritage area identified in SCHED3, or an Open Space Zone.	Yes	Reference to Heritage Area added.
1115	Stratum Management	1115.9	Stratum requests 'fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide' be reframed to requiring an assessment against the Residential Design Guide.	Yes	Current wording is considered appropriate and is used consistently across the plan.
	Stratum Management	1115.10	If Policy P4 requires that the intent of the Design Guide is fulfilled, then matter 4 of the matters of discretion is not required. As an alternative, matter 4 can be retained and the reference in the policy can be deleted, overcoming the concern raised above.	Yes	No change made – the matter of discretion is relevant to give effect to the CoC policy.
	Stratum	1115.11	MRZ-S15 - Stratum considers that this standard should be deleted, or at the least clarified. It is unclear whether the provision of a window to a room will result in compliance with this standard or if another measure is required. Moreover, the standard appears to require a greater requirement than the Building Code. An equivalent standard applies to the central city zone.	Yes	Agree standard should be deleted give problem in how it is measured and also taking into account new MDRS.
1106	Kirsten Todd	1106.1	Oppose Khandallah being zoned 6 stories particularly woodmancote road which is a narrow residential street needing school access. The Johnsonville train service is not rapid transit. The Khandallah village centre is a small neighbourhood centre not a local centre.	Yes	No change - walking catchment areas have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD.
1093	Architectural Centre - Daryl Cockburn	1093.4	The BRP rule must be changed to remove them from side boundaries, but can be kept on rear boundaries to provide daylight and some privacy to rear backyards and rear windows.	Yes	Recession planes on side boundaries will not be removed but they will be changed to align with new MDRS which are more enabling than the current plan.
	A Gude and S Terry - See page 294 of MRZ submission document.		While stating that the Medium Density Residential Zone "gives effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD"(at MRZ), this section of the Plan is apparently silent on which Qualifying Matters will be used in support of deviations from the requirements of Policy 3.	Yes	Agree - explanation added to chapter intros to say what qualifying matters are relevant to the zones.
	Port St, Earls Tce, Stafford St Mount Victoria Residents Submission – see page 309 of MRZ submission document.		We submit that the District Plan should be amended to adopt decreasing height limits from 21m to 8m as the landscape rises on Matairangi's face and ridges.	Yes	Heights are dictated by the NPS-UD and the MDRS, except within the character precincts.

	Martin Hibma		Multi-unit developments twice the height allowed for general housing erodes existing character and amenity of the precinct. From a town planning perspective, the proposed implementation appears particularly poor. There is justification for taller buildings along Kent Tce. Allowing 21m multi-unit development to ringfence pockets of character housing and along ridgelines such as the North side of Roxburgh St. And bordering the Town Belt not only negatively impact the immediate streetscape but also the appearance of the precinct from more distant cityscape views.	Yes		Heights are dictated by the NPS-UD and the MDRS, except within the character precincts. There are transition controls in place next to the character precincts and open space zones.
998	Johanna Drayton	998.1	Continue to oppose the Draft District Plan. It will not meet the voiced policy reasons behind it but will have grave consequences for the historic and amenity values in Mount Victoria.	Yes		Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD.
985 877 874 778 569 545 476 441 410	Sally Rose Roman Herbst Mike Hopkins Joy Wilkie Dorothy Benson Diana Benson Andrew Bowman Wendy Woods Dorothy Adams		<p>Opposition to increased height and character and amenity in Mt Vic and Aro Valley</p> <p>Oppose the six story height allowance</p> <p>Oppose removal of demolition rule & object to the removal of design specifications for new builds.</p> <p>Object to the exclusion of Tutchen Avenue in the Porritt Avenue character area.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the minimum daylight access rule. The provisions for sunlight hours in the current Operative District Plan provisions for sunlight hours must be retained to avoid existing homes becoming dark and damp.</p> <p>Submission from Roman Herbst also states that two hours of daylight is not sufficient, and does not necessarily allow for sunlight, and requests that this is at least doubled as in the current District Plan, and for sunlight to be the measure, not daylight.</p> <p>Submission also seeks boundary setbacks and site coverage limits for multi-unit development, and reduced recession planes from 12m to 6m, and concern that allowing 21 metres next to character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood, and to avoid this we ask that the minimum height be reduced to 11 metres for a much greater proportion of the Mount Cook area.</p> <p>Submission from Mike Hopkins opposes 14m and 21m height control areas and Height in relation to boundary controls. These cover far too big an area of Wellington and the heights are far too high. The impacts of these heights will be massively negative, creating domineering buildings with significant shading and complete loss of privacy to adjoining sites. Also disagrees with MRZ-S10 Maximum building length - limiting building length to 20m will not provide a break in building form. 20m in continuous length my cover the entire site boundary.</p> <p>Mike Hopkins also disagrees with minimum daylight access standard - This will not provide enough natural light and falls well short of ensuring that dwellings have a good quality healthy living environment.</p> <p>Jo Wilkie submits that protection of maximum possible day light for existing dwellings is imperative for physical and mental health and emotional well-being; reduction in requirement for non solar light, with savings on electricity and cost of living to Wellingtonians, and wider environmental benefits.</p> <p>Dorothy Benson concerned that the infrastructure in Mt Victoria is not sufficient to support the significant increase in population anticipated by the Draft Plan. Strongly object to the proposal to allow building of up to 21 meters in height along the western side of Austin Street. Building of this height will effectively "build out" smaller houses such as ours, impacting sunlight and privacy and ultimately quality of living. A building of that height to our North will ensure that our house gets no sun and will allow neighbours an unobstructed view into our backyard.</p> <p>Diana Benson: We strongly object to the proposal to allow buildings of up to 21 metres (7 stories) high along our western boundary at 44Roxburgh Street. Such development will significantly and detrimentally affect our sun, outlook and privacy and will affect all properties adjacent to ours in a similar way.</p>	Yes		<p>Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Current provisions relating to sunlight hours are in design guide. Note also other objections to this standard, and the new MDRS outlook standards.</p> <p>Also note that current and draft rules relate to rooms within a development and not adjacent to it.</p> <p>Lower 8m recession plane is proposed in respond to submissions.</p>

			<p>All opposed to 6 storeys in Hay Street for a variety of reasons including impact on public amenity values / visual character / views from Oriental Parade / topography / hazards / access – all of these should be considered as qualifying matters.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the 21 metre height limit in Hay Street and Baring Street, both very narrow with no possibility of making them wider. Even now emergency service vehicles have issues with access in Hay Street in particular. This area on the side of Mount Victoria is unstable and prone to slips. Add 6 storey dwellings and compound the problem. Was this aspect never checked ?</p> <p>The mixing of 3 and 6 storied buildings in Newtown will mean loss of sunlight to existing homes impacting upon the health of residents.</p> <p>Kate Giles submission also opposed to 6 storey height limit in Hay St and Baring Street because they are steep and narrow and prone to slips too - this becomes a serious safety issue.</p> <p>Molli Gibbs-Harris: The narrowness of Hay Street makes any increase of traffic a safety concern. We have had landslips close the road completely and an increase in the population of the area will put further stress on the road. Oriental Bay is a drawcard for visitors to the area and parking is already a major problem.</p> <p>Helen Foot: 1. I support the inclusion in the draft District Plan of the Oriental Bay Height Area. 2. I oppose the proposed changes to the zoning of the Hay Street and Baring Street as set out in the draft District Plan.</p> <p>Nigel Moody: opposed to the proposed rezoning of the area on both sides of lower to mid Hay Street from general residential to medium density.</p> <p>Maria Mackay - I also oppose the proposed 6 plus storey height limit in Hay St and Baring St. This proposal does not protect the character of Oriental Bay or recognise the infrastructure and safety shortcomings of steep and narrow Hay St which is also prone to slips</p> <p>Jenny Gyles - RE Request HAY STREET, Oriental Bay.... Numbers 1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19,21& 23 and numbers 2,4,6,8,10 Hay Street, Oriental Bay be removed from zone B of the Spatial Plan which these homes are situated your proposal to increase height limits</p> <p>All similar objections below.</p>	Yes	<p>Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Walking catchments have been checked and as a result location of footpath and driveways numbers 22 and 28 Hay have been reduced from 21 – 11m (high to medium zones).</p> <p>There are no other qualifying matters that would justify reducing heights / zones</p>
966	Keith Flinders				
880	Kate Giles				
643	Molli Gibbs-Harris				
	Helen Foot				
578	Nigel Moody and Cushla				
565	Roughton				
	Maria MacKay				
559	Don Mackay				
540	Bradley Ilg				
539	Jenny Gyles Trust				
528	Nicola Saker				
485	Virginia Barton-Chapple				
462	Gaynor Clarke				
447	Tore Hayward				
442	Kerry Waddell				
330	Lorraine Phillips				
299	Rosemary Bradford				
279	Frances Russell				
228	Freda Walker				
223	Ann Mallinson				
214	Judith Doyle				
183	Iain Fraser				
150	Emily Pfeffer and Chris Curry				
148	Diane Radford				
	Barry Soper				
101	Lorraine Christie				
92					
62					

937 907	Name: Linda Bruwer on behalf Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	937.1	MRZ-P6 - The main concern is the transition between areas that is 21m in height and the character areas that are 11 meters in height. There seems to be a lack of policy and standards managing the interface between the two height areas. This will lead to the character areas being boxed in and resulting in reduced amenity in these areas. We therefore suggest the following changes: Strengthening the policy to guide decision making on development form in the interface between the character area and the multiunit developments; add 4 th point to MRZ-P6 as follows: 4. Where these buildings and structures are in a site adjacent to a character precinct, that their form and scale be sympathetic towards the Character Precinct and does not represent development that is over bulk and height.	Yes	Additional assessment criteria has been added: <i>For any site adjacent to a character precinct or heritage area, the effects on the identified character or heritage values.</i>
		937.2	We request that multi-unit's development adjacent to character zones should also have a maximum site coverage of 70%. This will ensure a further management of amenity in character precincts.	Yes	No change – this is considered contrary to NPS-UD.
934	Josephine Brien	934.1	Three of the sites adjacent to the Green Belt block, next to Te Aro School (360 The Terrace) and coloured gray on this map are marked as being able to be built up to 21m/6 stories high - There is no need to subject the children and teachers of Te Aro School to the shading that buildings of up to 33.6m/9 stories on one side and 21m/6 stories on the other three would bring. A lot of the children come from shady Aro Valley homes - let them have some sun at school!	Yes	Change made - transition height to boundary standards next has been applied next to schools.
	John Gasson		Submits that 11m within MRZ for Brooklyn is too high and that current GRZ rules should apply.	Yes	MDRS must be incorporated into the new plan.
847	Marilyn Scannell - submission of residents of Lower Kelburn	847.1	Submission recommends that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lower Kelburn be recognized as a special character area in the draft district plan and that, in particular, the maximum height proposed be reduced from 21 metres to 11 metres; - The area to the west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and eastern side of Bolton Street and the area broadly centered around Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace be included in the exiting special character area that currently includes the west side of Bolton Street to Tinakori Road and the adjoining Thorndon precinct. - Furthermore, this special character area be protected from future density development planning recommendations until the recommended areas noted above have been developed. 	Yes	Character area boundaries have been set through the Spatial Plan and cannot be changed now at pre-notified plan stage.
796	Chad Oliver	796.2 796.3	Suggest that MRZ-S12.1 should be modified to read: "Any outdoor living space or habitable room window aboveground floor level must be at least 2m from any boundary except a road boundary <i>or a railway boundary</i> ". MRZ-S15 Min daylight access - This provision should be entirely removed. It is confusing, and depending on how "daylight" it is interpreted it is either redundant or disastrously restrictive. Suggests instead that require a certain volume of empty space outside the window (as is done regularly in district plans). Or even better, leave this for the building code, which is the appropriate place for this sort of rule to be.	Yes	Agree this change. Also agree all comments relating to Min daylight access standards as drafted.
789	Chris Fox	789.1	removing the requirement for a resource consent is completely counter to the rights of individuals to protect sunlight, views, and other matters. Six storey apartment blocks, without resource consent in many areas of Mt Victoria is not the answer. There are many areas, as noted, that can accommodate greater housing density. Even considering buildings without resource consent is completely against the view (of the many silent majority).	Yes	Have to implement the MDRS and new 6 storey building will require a resource consent.
704	Lily Stelling		Support that Lower Kelburn has higher density (6 stories) houses. Kelburn is a prime place for students and young working people, and rents are unbelievably high.	No	
698	Escape Investments Ltd		Supports the zoning and maximum building height standard of 21m for 6 Hay Street shown in the Draft District Plan. There are no 'qualifying matters' (s3.32NPSUD) that would require a change to the proposed zoning or maximum building height limit of the 6 Hay Street area.	No	
656	Cosgrove Goodwin		A lower recession plane to the Southern boundary should be added.	Yes	No change to southern recession plane boundary but recession plane has been reduced from 12 – 10m.

	Architects - Paul McCardle				
	Cosgrove Goodwin Architects - Paul McCardle		MRZ-S10 & S11 – This rule is unclear. The total building length or a ‘part’ of a building (elevation?).It seems like this rule ties in with S11, but they only really support one kind of development – 20m apartment blocks with 10myards between. There will still be multi-unit developments that suit a more stepped or disbursed layout or with yards having a different orientation and which may have less effects on bulk.	Yes	Diagram has been prepared to help with clarity.
630	Martin & Penny Krafft		Support increasing heights to 21m in Mt Vic.	No	
596	Oriental Bay Residents Association - Andrew Meehan		OBRA supports the Oriental Bay Height Area (status quo on the Parade) as contained in the draft District Plan. The Oriental Bay Height Area implements the judgment in Helen Foot & Others v WCC W73/98. OBRA opposes the proposed 21 metre (6 plus storey) height limit in Hay St and Baring St, in order to protect the character of Oriental Bay and recognise the infrastructure and safety shortcomings of these steep and narrow streets which are also prone to slips. OBRA supports the submissions made by residents which contain more detailed evidence about the existence of “qualifying matters” within the terms of part 3.32 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD).The District Plan should not apply a ‘blanket’ zone for increased height limits within a zone around Oriental Parade. Rather, site-specific analysis should be undertaken for the individual sites. OBRA is particularly cognisant of matters relating to landscape; heritage; character; infrastructure, and other critically important matters, and urges WCC to review its decision to allow development up to 21 metres in Hay St and Baring St.	Yes	Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD. Walking catchments have been checked and as a result location of footpath and driveways numbers 22 and 28 Hay have been reduced from 21 – 11m (high to medium zones). There are no other qualifying matters that would justify reducing heights / zones
499	Marion Henderson		NO HIGH RISES in character areas. Build them where there are no existing older homes.	Yes	Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD and cannot be changed now at pre-notified plan stage.
491	Chico Bryd		Oppose the part of the District Plan that makes a lot of the streets in Mt Cook "medium density.' This will ruin our community. We love living here because of the beautiful old homes and the sense of history we see every day.	Yes	As above and note this will become high density zone.
490	Dean McKay		Concern with raising building height limits for the whole of Rolleston Street to 21 metres, without considering the terrain and effects on the amenity of the street. WCCs intensification plans should be softened to preserve the best aspects of the existing neighbourhood and residents' amenity.	Yes	Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD.
477	Spike Cocker		NO to destruction of my neighbourhood (Mt Cook) by adopting the "medium density housing" designation. Please reconsider the boundaries of "medium density housing."	Yes	As above and note this will become high density zone.
377	Dennis Hunt		Primary comments are; 1. The Draft District Plan proposed conditions are too general for the area bounded by Bolton Street, Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and the urban motorway, and a more refined approach to determining future development is justified. 2. Rose and Botanical Gardens will become increasingly popular with the residents of and visitors to the city and are of significant historical significance and amenity value. Any development that compromises the approach to the Gardens from Wesley Road (such as 21 metre high buildings on either side of the road) would be inconsistent with this historical significance, and the green space thrust of the adopted Spatial Plan 2021	Yes	Walking catchment areas and associated rules enabling high density have been set through the Spatial Plan and the NPS-UD. Lower recession planes will apply next to open space zones.
	Brett McKay		MDRZ needs to include policies which recognise the importance and value of inner residential character areas (including Thorndon) in promoting Wellingtons unique sense of place.	Yes	The character policies are considered appropriate.
292	Sarah Talboys		Oppose MRZ-S8 Maximum Height. In particular the maximum height of 21m for a six storey building. The commonly used method is to allow 4.0m for a ground floor and 3.0m for subsequent floors, so 19m for six storeys. The WCC consultants, Boffa Miskell used 18.6m for six storeys.	Yes	Recession planes reduced from 12m to 8m in response to submissions.
158	Peter Hill		Oppose MRZ-S9 Height in relation to boundary. These are much too severe and will result in unacceptable shading to existing dwellings.		

		<p>Oppose MRZ-S15 Minimum Daylight Access. By using "daylight" instead of "sunlight" all the well-known beneficial effects of sunlight are obviated. I advocate that a minimum standard of 3 hours of sunlight at the winter solstice be used instead. There is no specific protection of sunlight access to neighbouring properties when new developments are built. I advocate for a minimum standard of 3 hours of sunlight at the winter solstice into living rooms.</p> <p>I advocate that WCC pursue a policy of developing residential apartments in brownfields first and, then, only if necessary, to allow development in the current character areas of Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Newtown and Thorndon.</p> <p>Oppose MRZ-S9 Height in relation to boundary. These are much too severe and will result in unacceptable shading to existing dwellings. I advocate not using Height in Relation to Boundary and using sunlight access to neighbouring dwellings instead. The Auckland Unitary Plan Terrace Housing and Apartments Buildings Zone sunlight access parameters (Indoor Living 3hrs direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm in mid-winter) have been shown to work well.</p> <p>I advocate establishing sunlight access protection to existing solar collectors. These collectors are a public as well as a private good in that they reduce energy consumption, some of which will be fossil fuelled. They contribute to the WCC goal of becoming carbon neutral. "Solar collector" is a generic term that covers photo-voltaics, hot water heaters and the less commonly used air heaters that look like hot water heaters but instead heat air which is then ducted to the building interior for space heating purposes. I propose a new District Plan Rule that prevents shading from a new building development from causing a drop in energy output from existing solar collectors of more than 30%</p>		
--	--	--	--	--