

Sub No.	Specific Provision	Submission Summary	Decision Requested	Wish to be heard	Further Submissions
Comments on Whole of Plan Change 56					
1	Whole of PC56	Submitter supports tightening of the rules and agrees with the proposals in PC56. Of particular concern is that infill housing should not block sunshine or main view of adjoining neighbours. The submitters consider that infill housing in the outer suburbs should only be permitted if it is at least 2m from all boundaries and building in a style to blend with surrounding homes, is restricted to one storey (unless all other houses are two storey) and where land levels are raised, that solid retaining walls and adequate draining is required.	To approve the plan change as proposed. Note concerns about building infill housing closer than 2m to boundaries and requirement for adequate retaining walls and drainage.	No	
4	Whole of PC56	The submitter holds several concerns with proposed Plan Change 56 as it will give the Council more rules and regulations with which to unfairly burden those who have bought property with the intention of being able to build additional structures on it. The submitter supports the current rules in the Plan and states that if you want to change those rules then it should only apply to property purchased after the notification of the Plan Change. The submitter believes there are sufficient existing regulations, which if used properly, would stop many of the ugly examples of high density infill (eg. streetscape, height planes, 35% site coverage).	Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly.	Unknown	
7	Whole of PC56	The submitter supports the whole Plan Change as he considers that the current provisions are far too liberal and do not give adequate protection for neighbours views, light etc. The new provisions will greatly improve the situation and provide a much fairer deal for neighbours.	Approve the Proposed District Plan Change.	No	
12	Whole of PC56	The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety as it is concerned at the inevitable cumulative effects of infill development on the amenity and character of Ngaio. The submitter has particular concerns about the height of recent new (and proposed) infill development. In the hilly suburb it allows designers to excavate and create structures up to 4 stories high, completely out of scale with the residential context. Approval is also given for the desire to minimise hard paved areas and promote on-site drainage. Approval is given to section 3.2.3.8 (requirements for a site development plan – subdivision), Policies 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B and the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides. Approval is given to Policies 4.2.3.1.A – 4.2.3.1.C, 4.2.3.3, 4.2.4.1A and rules 5.1.1.2, 5.1.3.2, 5.1.3.2B, 5.1.3.4.3, 5.3.1.6, 5.3.1.11, 5.3.3.3, 5.4.5.2A, 5.4.5.2B.	Adopt the plan change in its entirety.	No	

15	Whole of PC56	The submitter supports the Plan Change, particularly the new residential policies, as they relate well to Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) which identifies good urban design and protection of amenity values as key elements in achieving environmental quality in urban areas. The open space provisions, the height restriction for 2nd units on a site, and the stronger policy approach to encourage the retention of mature trees and bush and minimises hard surfaces are consistent with Policies (1) and 8(2) of the RPS. The submitters supports the use of the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides (in particular the new section on Individual Lot Design) to manage the effects of infill housing. In respect of the Subdivision Design Guide, the guidance to incorporate on-site water quality treatments measures is also supported.	That the Council adopt Plan Change 56.	Yes	
33	Whole of PC56	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	That the Council approve PC 56 for inclusion in the District Plan, but specifically notes a number of suggested amendments.	No	
38	Whole of PC56	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change	The submitter seeks the abandonment of PC 56 on that basis that it is poorly conceived and contains unworkable provisions.	Yes	
55	Whole of PC56	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety. Specific provisions outlined elsewhere.	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	
59	Whole of PC56	The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous.	That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.	Yes	
78	Whole of PC56	The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur and the policies now send mixed messages (eg. policies under 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4).	That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.	Yes	
79	Whole of PC56	The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur and the policies now send mixed messages (eg. policies under 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4).	That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.	Yes	
47	Whole of PC56	Supports the Plan Change, considering the aim to increase the quality of infill and multi-unit housing developments is important to the continuing development of Wellington as a city.	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	

83	Whole of PC56	The submitter considers the plan change over reaches to such an extent that the changes will curtail infill housing to a degree that would be inconsistent with the Plan's objectives to retain a compact city. The rules as currently drafted are likely to be more detrimental to suburbs than beneficial as suburbs that attract development and renewal invariably benefit from it. The submitter has particular concerns about the need to focus more tightly on controlling 'externalities' that arise from infill housing and to focus less on internal amenity values. The submitter notes support for the need to have flexibility in administration of the rules (ie. council discretion), but notes the importance of ensuring that there is clarity of purpose in the rules. Processes should be improved to support this discretion (including effective pre-application meetings, site visits at pre-application stage, review of decisions, timeframes for dealing with the consent). The submitter also notes that the Council should be willing to allocate appropriate resource to administration of the new policies and rules rather than requiring the applicant to bear the full cost.		That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
Chapter 3: Information Requirements						
33	3.2.2	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.		3.2.2 (subdivision consent information requirements): changes are supported, but doubts the value that having "common furniture items drawn to scale" will have in considering neighbourhood effects.	No	
44	3.2.2	Supports a number of these provisions, but also seeks some amendments (wording supplied)		That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
38	3.2.3	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change		Section 3.2.3.9: delete first bullet point as it is superfluous and potentially misleading.	Yes	
67	3.2.3	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.		Section 3.2.3: the proposed additional items required as part of subdivision consents increase the level of detail needed beyond what should be needed for Council to assess the effects of the proposal. The submitter seeks a number of changes to this section (draft wording supplied).	Yes	
70	3.2.3	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.		Section 3.2.3.9: note that the accuracy of aerial photography is generally poor when compared to site survey data. The Council has easy access to this information therefore the time and cost to produce such information compulsorily by applicants seems unnecessary.	Yes	
51	3.2.4	The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.		That the provision requiring furniture items to be drawn to scale on plans stems from concerns about room size. Reintroduce the old NZS 1900 Chp 3 on minimum room sizes, or something suitable to our age.	No	
83	3.2.4	Delete reference to illustration of plans with common furniture items etc.		That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	

Chapter 3: Definitions

23	Definitions	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Site Area Definition and access ways: A refinement to the rule which removes areas used for permanent access from the calculation of site area for unit title, cross lease and company lease subdivisions. This provision should equally apply to situations where only a land use consent is sought in relation to a multi-unit development. Wording suggestions provided.	No	
23	Definitions	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Definition of 'Access Strip': this revised definition continues to cause confusion due to the double negative used in the second part of the definition. Revised wording is suggested to clarify this.	No	
33	Definitions	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Definition of 'site': should be reviewed as it may enable intense development on small parts of original sites.	No	
33	Definitions	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	3.10 Definitions: changes are supported to give greater clarity	No	
55	Definitions	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically definitions for access strip and site area	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	
56	Definitions	The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an 'Infill Household Unit' and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.	A definition be included within Chapter 3.10 of the Plan: "Infill Household Unit – means a development within the Outer Residential Area involving the creation of a second and only additional household unit which is outside the footprint of an existing household unit and on a fee simple site of less than 1000m ² ."	Yes	
67	Definitions	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Definition of Access Strip: that the status quo remains or at least that the proposed definition needs significant further refinement (note Hearing Committee comments on this issue in Plan Change 6, the effect on the sunlight access plane rules and how access strip will probably be defined to mean all areas of 'common property').	Yes	
67	Definitions	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Definition of Site Area: the definition should revert back to its original form as notified in the July 2004 Plan and note that the open space requirement will have a doubling up effect on front lots when the right of way is excluded and open space also required.	Yes	

69	Definitions	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Definition of Site Area: Delete the revised definition as the existing site coverage requirements in combination with the proposed open space provisions are sufficient to ensure adequate open space is provided around infill developments. If the definition is retained, ensure that the right of way is included in the calculation for any lot approved before 5 May 2007.	Yes	
69	Definitions	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Definition of Access Strip: Delete the revised definition as it will result in 'amenity areas' also defined as common property being included in the definition which is not intended.	Yes	
44	Definitions	Seeks change to the Defn of "Access Strip" and "Site Area"	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
Chapter 4: Residential Areas Objectives and Policies					
33	4.1	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Section 4.1: supported.	No	
83	4.1	Add in further sentence and wording to clarify these paragraphs (wording supplied).	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
44	4.2.1	Supports changes, but seeks one clarification to the phrase "good quality"	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	4.2.1	Add in additional wording to clarify intent	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
Residential Amenity Objectives and Policies (especially policies 4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B)					
2	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter supports the Plan Change, in particular the ... provision requiring infill housing to be of a similar character to those in the immediate vicinity. The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.	That the plan change rules are supported	No	
6	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter supports the restrictions proposed in Plan Change 56 as at the moment too many sections are subdivided and built on behind or in front of existing homes, spoiling character and atmosphere of the street and suburb. The submitter is also concerned that new subdivisions are created and \$500,000 homes erected with hardly any garden space in front or behind and with too limited distance between houses.	That the council impose restrictions to homeowners, buildings, architects and developers so as to safeguard the traditional setups of a new or existing suburbs.	No	
11	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.	Seeks that new houses in established neighbourhoods have to conform with the rest of the street.	No	
18	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter fully supports limiting the height of the second unit to single storey....	All infill housing is in keeping with the character of surrounding homes and of a similar height	Unknown	
28	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	That infill housing should be sympathetic to the character of existing and surrounding homes	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	

29	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Policy 4.2.2.1A: "unduly restrictive". Delete the word 'consistent' from the policy and include further explanatory text to clarify when intensification of housing density might be appropriate.	Yes	
29	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Policy 4.2.2.1B: supports this policy so seeks its retention.	Yes	
33	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Policies 4.2.2: supported as this is the heart of the infill problem. Suburbs or areas within them should have their character defined for certainty and guidance.	No	
36	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter supports PC 56, in particular the objective to limit the number of houses per site ...	To make the suggested change to DP 56 .	No	
52	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter strongly supports the following rules and policies: 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B ...	That the Council design and make compulsory laws/regulations to ensure that infill housing (in neighbourhoods that have the majority of their housing in single dwelling, or only two single storey dwellings per property) reflects the character of the neighbourhood and does not affect the quality of current residents' lifestyles with regard to sunlight, privacy, over crowding or noise.	Yes	
57	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter seeks some wording amendments to three parts of the plan change to acknowledge that neighbours, other than immediately adjoining neighbours, can be affected by infill developments and secondly the loss of sound amenity (through increased noise) is also a valid effect that needs consideration.	Policy 4.2.2.1B: add "and neighbours not immediately adjoining" in three places: 1. end of third para. 2. end of 2nd sentence of sixth para, 3. third sentence of eighth para after "adjoining neighbours".	No	
59	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous: Reduction in number of units allowed on the site as of right	That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.	Yes	
60	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter makes a particular submission about Policy 4.2.2.1B and the associated explanatory text. The submitter supports the provision but holds concerns that the policy may be interpreted to support further infill in areas that have already been subjected to infill. The submitter is keen to ensure that previous infill does not create a presumption that new infill will be approved.	That the words "existing residential development" in the 2 nd to last sentence of Policy 4.2.2.1B are amended to read "existing residential type and character" or words to that effect so as to clarify that the compatibility sought is with the existing character not with existing development.	Yes	
65	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Policy 4.2.2.1B (para 9) and 4.2.4-1A (Para 6): These comments do not follow the provisions and intent set out under the RMA.	Yes	

67	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Policies 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B: The policy should be deleted or rewritten with a change of focus as it is not justified in the context of the reasons for this plan change and it is in conflict with the subdivision policies (4.2.4.1 and 4.2.4.1A). Suggested policy replacement drafted. Also concerned with the comments regarding cumulative effects and the link to 5.3.3.13.	Yes	
68	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding the issues that derive from infill housing. The submitter states the two primary issues that arise from infill housing include the increased population of an area and the pressures on existing infrastructure, and that new buildings detract from the quality of life and value of nearby properties.	The submitter notes that 1. Prominent properties with the potential to significantly block views of others must have restrictions placed on how much view they can block. 2. Older suburban areas with larger properties need to have their specific characters preserved because that is why people move into these areas. 3. It is important to have in place good rules that preserve the value of existing houses and new developments must not be allowed to detract from long established homes.	Unknown	
69	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Policy 4.2.2.1A: should be deleted or at the very least rewritten to reflect the fact that infill housing is a desirable activity which has benefits to the city.	Yes	
70	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Note that while the revised policies do act to strengthen the Plan's objectives, unless there is a significant shift to better recognition of city wide cumulative effects, applications will continue to apply to break the rules rather than strive to meet them. Another approach to managing density could be to create ratios of site coverage to usable open space on a sliding scale.	Yes	
84	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Explanatory text for policies 4.2.2.1 – 4.2.2.1B: clarify how the cumulative effects of very minor breaches to the permitted activity standards is to be judged. Define the length and height of a minor breach for all parties to follow.	Yes	
84	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Policy 4.2.2.1: Clarify whether the intent is to allow two storey's or 9m buildings (which can be 3 stories). The choice of which unit is to be single story should be based on streetscape, topography and site orientation, not on which was built first. Further thought is needed as some areas may change dramatically. Clarify also whether an extra 1m is allowed for pitched roofs. May result in tiered developments on sloping sites.	Yes	
84	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Policy 4.2.2.1: There needs to be enough flexibility in the "following of patterns" to allow for good design, ie. it should not enforce a rigid repetition of character of a few existing houses where those houses are not of good design.	Yes	

84	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Policy 4.2.2.1 - Cumulative effects: common with Wellington topography that there are several breaches of rules, which may be minor in each case. Needs to be some definition where there are a number of breaches to prevent a blanket approach being adopted and notification being called each time there is more than one breach. A system to test out the severity of breaches could be extremely useful.	Yes	
44	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	Supports changes, but does seek some further clarification and change to one part of the explanatory statements.	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B	Offers several wording amendments to clarify intent.	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
9	4.2.2.1- 4.2.2.1B	Supports new text in paragraph 8 of objective 4.2.2 requiring new development to be consistent with the scale of dwellings in the residential environment. New architecture should be in sympathy with storey height, roof pitch and texture, cladding, window type and fencing.	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
Residential Character and Streetscape Objectives and Policies (especially policies 4.2.3.1A - 4.2.3.1C, 4.2.3.3)					
33	4.2.3	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Objective 4.2.3: supported except that it risks generalising outer residential as "more diverse".	No	
70	4.2.3	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Policy 4.2.3.3: Concerned that commentary in the policies around not applying the permitted baseline to multi-unit developments is inconsistent with the case law.	Yes	
84	4.2.3	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Streetscape: concerned that its too late now to respect existing designs in most streets. Why pull down new house design to the lowest common denominator.	Yes	
44	4.2.3	general support, but there are some elements that require amendments	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
9	4.2.3.1	Policy 4.2.3.1 (1 st paragraph). Seeks that these provisions are strengthened to keep streetscapes from being changed, this is particularly important where groups of houses were built to a pattern even if they aren't in a designated historic area.	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
9	4.2.3.1A	The change to require more green space is welcomed as the proliferation of two storied homes on small sections devoid of greenery has not enhanced suburban housing (Policy 4.2.3.1A).		No	
29	4.2.3.1A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Policy 4.2.3.1A and Rule 5.1.3.2B: use advocacy only regarding open space policy. Amend wording of the policy (draft wording supplied) and delete open space rule.	Yes	

33	4.2.3.1A	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Policy 4.2.3.1.A (open space): is too imprecise, provide greater specificity about the nature of those effects. The explanatory text is supported.	No	
36	4.2.3.1A	The submitter supports PC 56, in particular ... Policy 4.2.3.1A and rule 5.1.3.2B (open space)	To make the suggested change to DP 56 .	No	
65	4.2.3.1A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Policy 4.2.3.1A (para 1) and Rule 5.1.3.2B: Further clarify the intent of the open space rule to match the stated policy in relation to the greenness or otherwise of the open space and whether it can be split into different locations provided the width requirement is maintained. (Suggested wording changes supplied).	Yes	
84	4.2.3.1A	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Policy 4.2.2.1, 4.2.3.1A, Rule 5.1.3.2B: Note the open space can be usable without being on ground level or connected to a living area. Suggest change in size requirement so that 50m ² for first unit and then 40m ² for subsequent units. Suggest that 4m width minimum be replaced with an area that contains a 4m square box. Allow design flexibility where open space is on a sloping site that may be unusable. Steep sites cannot always have the required outdoor space suggested in the design guide. Why should a reduced outdoor area require neighbours consent?	Yes	
47	4.2.3.1A	Support the return to an open space requirement. And support G1.2 and G6.2 of the Residential Design Guide. Support ability to mass open spaces into larger common areas. Consider requirement G3.1 (slope of open space areas) to be inappropriate for sloping sites.	Provide alternative guidelines for provision of open space on sloping sites. G3.2: "direct short range overlooking" needs greater definition to be usefully applied. G1.7: note that different patterns of habitation might mean that other times of the day when the 'principle' open space receives sun might be more appropriate.	Unknown	
44	4.2.3.1A	Seek one change to this policy (wording supplied)	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	4.2.3.1A	Reword this policy to remove reference to 'green open space' and amend the explanatory text	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
43	4.2.3.1A - 4.2.3.1C	Support for open space, hard surfacing and retention of trees and bush (4.2.3.1A – 4.2.3.1C) are supported but are concerned about long term compliance and monitoring of such consent conditions.	That the Commissioners recognise the long term compliance and monitoring of consent conditions (around landscaping, hard surfacing, open space etc) as an issue in their recommendations to Council and request that adequate funding be allocated for this and that the monitoring element be recognised in the fees and charges for new infill developments.	Yes	
67	4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Policies 4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B: reword policies so that they do need to be 'green' and that paved terraces and decks can be considered as open space (draft wording supplied).	Yes	

69	4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Policies 4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B: policies do not reflect the rule. As decks and paved areas are considered to be open spaces under the rule, the use of the word 'green' is misleading and should be removed.	Yes	
9	4.2.3.1B	Similarly the need for greater hard surfacing areas for vehicle access and parking detracts from the quality of the streetscape.	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
29	4.2.3.1B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	4.2.3.1B: generally supports hard surfacing policy, but seeks clarification that well designed hard surfaced outdoor living areas are appropriate.	Yes	
36	4.2.3.1B	The submitter supports PC 56, in particular ... policy 4.2.3.1B (hard surfaces).	To make the suggested change to DP 56 .	No	
80	4.2.3.1B	The submitter generally supports the plan change but consider the new provisions do not sufficiently explain the reasons for limiting impermeable site coverage. The submission outlines a variety of environmental effects that can result from increased hard surfacing of sites.	That the Plan spells out clearly in the rules for infill housing and subdivision the hidden hazards that can arise from removing vegetation, increasing the area of permanent hardstand, increasing the flow volumes of storm-water and sewage, and earthworks.	Yes	
44	4.2.3.1B	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	4.2.3.1B	Reword this policy to remove reference to 'green open space' and amend the explanatory text	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
9	4.2.3.1C	Seeks clarification on what the policy is in regard to the preservation or replanting of mature exotic trees (refer to Policy 4.2.3.1C)?	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
27	4.2.3.1C	The submitters support the proposals to limit the height and site coverage of developments in residential areas. Other effects noted by the submitters include loss of privacy and sunlight, most vegetation cleared from the site and replaced with concrete or buildings and a significant increase in traffic.	We want the Council to restrict the amount of vegetation that can be removed from the site.	Yes	
28	4.2.3.1C	That there should be protection of existing vegetation, particularly mature tress (support 4.2.3.1C and 5.1.3.2B)	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
29	4.2.3.1C	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Policy 4.3.2.1C: supports tree and bush retention policy so seeks its retention.	Yes	
33	4.2.3.1C	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Policy 4.2.3.1.C (retention of trees and bush): is supported to retain openness.	No	

36	4.2.3.1C	The Submitters support policy 4.2.3.1C (retention of trees and bush) but consider it needs to be stronger than just "encourage".	To make the suggested change to DP 56 and note our comments ... regarding a suitable cross reference to WCC's Indigenous Biodiversity Plan.	No	
51	4.2.3.1C	The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.	Policy 4.2.3.1C (retention of trees): needs more work as mature trees cause problems too around shading and leaf drainage disruption. Also, landscaping plans are all that are needed rather than trying to prevent the removal of trees prior to development.	No	
47	4.2.3.1C	Support this, along with G6.7, G1.12	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	
44	4.2.3.1C	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	4.2.3.1C	Reword this policy to remove reference to 'green open space' and amend the explanatory text	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
9	4.2.3.3	Policy 4.2.3.3. Seeks the imposition of aesthetic control over developers and architects in relation to tall solid fences, window and door size especially in areas of older or heritage housing stock.	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
33	4.2.3.3	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Policy 4.2.3.3: revised explanatory text supported as a generalised but generally accurate description.	No	
58	4.2.3.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Policy 4.2.3.3: "new rules are over controlling". Prefer that any non-compliance of permitted activity thresholds move to a controlled activity status rather than directly to discretionary status. Also, the assessment of proposals against the design guides should be at the Controlled activity threshold rather than as discretionary activities.	Yes	
62	4.2.3.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Policy 4.2.3.3: "new rules are over controlling". Prefer that any non-compliance of permitted activity thresholds move to a controlled activity status rather than directly to discretionary status. Also, the assessment of proposals against the design guides should be at the Controlled activity threshold rather than as discretionary activities.	Yes	
63	4.2.3.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Policy 4.2.3.3: "new rules are over controlling". Prefer that any non-compliance of permitted activity thresholds move to a controlled activity status rather than directly to discretionary status. Also, the assessment of proposals against the design guides should be at the Controlled activity threshold rather than as discretionary activities.	Yes	

65	4.2.3.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Policy 4.2.3.3 (para 4): Oppose the statement that the Council will not consider the permitted baseline when considering the effects of multi-unit developments. Change the word 'will' to 'may' to ensure the Council is left with discretion to consider the permitted baseline as needed.	Yes	
76	4.2.3.3	The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. Particular support is given to Policy 4.2.3.3 and its explanatory text...,	Approve Plan Change 56	Yes	
84	4.2.3.3	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Explanatory text for Policy 4.2.3.3: define what compatibility with surrounding residential environment means, hopefully it does not restrict the ascetic of new buildings outside heritage zones.	Yes	
83	4.2.3.3	Amend wording of explanatory text.	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
Subdivision Objectives and Policies (especially policies 4.2.4.1 - 4.2.4.1A)					
33	4.2.4	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Objective 4.2.4 (subdivisions): changes are supported, especially the paragraph that discusses the height of second dwellings and the triggers for it.	No	
65	4.2.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Policy 4.2.2.1B (para 9) and 4.2.4-1A (Para 6): These comments do not follow the provisions and intent set out under the RMA.	Yes	
65	4.2.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Policy 4.2.4.1A (para 4): Oppose the use of covenants to ensure that residential dwellings are built in accordance with the approved subdivision. We would sooner see the Council issue a consent notice to limit the height of a future dwelling than restrict the nature of the design.	Yes	
67	4.2.4	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Policy 4.2.4.1A: a small wording change is requested to this policy (draft wording supplied).	Yes	
44	4.2.4	general support, but there are some elements that require amendments	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	4.2.4	Some minor wording changes to the explanatory text	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
9	4.2.4.1	Policy 4.2.4.1/Rule 5.3.4.12. Notes the overlooking adjacent properties might be mitigated by placing new dwellings obliquely or at an angle.	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
Chapter 5: Residential Area Rules					
Vehicle Parking and Access					
4	5.1.1.2	One car park per unit is necessary and acceptable and asks that the Council actively assist residents to provide off-street parking (rather than providing disincentives eg. increased encroachment fees etc).	Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly.	Unknown	
11	5.1.1.2	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.	Seeks that developers be required to consider more off-street parking as one park per house is usually not enough for the number of cars per household, putting a strain on streets that are already at capacity.	No	

14	5.1.1.2	The submitter does not however support the visitor car parking requirement if it entails removing the front fence as street level to provide a car pad for 3-4 vehicles as this would create visual pollution and be hazardous to pedestrians. Support for the visitor car parking requirements is only provided if the parking is provided at the rear of a site.	Requirements for the provision of visitor parking if it is discrete. It should not be allowed inappropriately in character suburbs.	No	
22	5.1.1.2	The submitter supports the proposed visitor car parking requirement as street parking is already at a premium in many parts of the city and infill development puts a further strain on this.	The submitter supports all changes currently proposed and would like these to remain.	No	
23	5.1.1.2	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Rule 5.1.1.2 Visitor car parking requirement: Three changes required. One to include developments processed under rule 5.2.4 and one to amend the statement below the rule which clarifies how many spaces are required depending on the number of units provided. The third change is to provide an assessment criterion for failure to provide required visitor parking. Wording suggestions provided.	No	
29	5.1.1.2	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Rule 5.1.1.2: remove visitor parking rule as its inclusion not justified by s32 report.	Yes	
33	5.1.1.2	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Rule 5.1.1.2 (visitor parking): how will the provision be monitored and enforced?	No	
51	5.1.1.2	The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.	Rule 5.1.1.2: the visitor parking standard is too harsh. One in six would be more appropriate.	No	
55	5.1.1.2	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.1.2: visitor parking	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	
70	5.1.1.2	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.1.1.2: visitor parking should not be rounded down, rather all fractions should be rounded up to ensure the minimum performance standards are met.	Yes	
84	5.1.1.2	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Rule 5.1.1.2: good idea, but impossible to ensure parks kept for visitors.	Yes	
44	5.1.1.2	Seeks amendments to provide greater clarity. Transpose final statement to sit before the bullet point.	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
44	5.1.1.3	Site access changes supported.	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	

58	5.1.1.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.1.3.4 and 5.3.1.6: Conflict between the urban design requirements for carparking and the rule requiring carparking. Consider reducing the carparking on site rule in inner residential areas or hill-side sites if they are close to public transport routes.	Yes	
62	5.1.1.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.1.3.4 and 5.3.1.6: Conflict between the urban design requirements for carparking and the rule requiring carparking. Consider reducing the carparking on site rule in inner residential areas or hill-side sites if they are close to public transport routes.	Yes	
63	5.1.1.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.1.3.4 and 5.3.1.6: Conflict between the urban design requirements for carparking and the rule requiring carparking. Consider reducing the carparking on site rule in inner residential areas or hill-side sites if they are close to public transport routes.	Yes	
Permitted Subdivision					
67	5.1.11	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.1.11: lower the thresholds and information requirements for meeting a permitted activity subdivision.	Yes	
Permitted Building Standards (includes open space, height of second unit, existing uses rule)					
57	5.1.3	The submitter seeks some wording amendments to three parts of the plan change to acknowledge that neighbours, other than immediately adjoining neighbours, can be affected by infill developments and secondly the loss of sound amenity (through increased noise) is also a valid effect that needs consideration.	Rule 5.1.3.A4: in first para of explanatory text, the words "both visual and sound" before the word 'amenity' at the end of first para.	No	
2	5.1.3.2B	The submitter supports the Plan Change, in particular the open space provisions... The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.	That the plan change rules are supported	No	
4	5.1.3.2B	The proposed new 50sq.metre open space is far too excessive for the needs of residents.	Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly.	Unknown	
10	5.1.3.2B	The submitter opposes the provisions especially the ... amount of open space required and the manner in which the plan change was implemented. The Submitter considers the plan change will stifle city growth, push land prices up, encourage urban sprawl and the proliferation of tiny single level dwellings. The plan change has wide ranging effect that has not been well thought out and cuts across citizens property rights.	That the Council fully consult with not only residents that don't want change but industry and those that wish to live in areas affected to develop a reasonable approach.	Yes	
14	5.1.3.2B	The submitter supports tighter controls on subdivision as well as the design guide, the reduction of the permitted height for the second unit on a site and the open space requirements.	Open space requirement for the Inner (35sq.m) and Outer Residential Areas (50 sq.m)	No	
18	5.1.3.2B	The submitter fully supports ...introducing open space requirements for each dwelling...	Adequate open space provide to allow for lawns and gardens	Unknown	

21	5.1.3.2B	The submitter agrees with the main pointers of the Plan Change to improve the quality of infill housing but does note one particular reservation regarding the open space requirement. One concern is that the open space requirement is not justified or will be feasible for all proposed new dwellings in Wellington, given the size of sections in Wellington and also Wellington's climate. However the submitter does state that buildings should not be built too close to each other either so believes boundary restrictions are necessary.	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
22	5.1.3.2B	The submitter supports the open space requirement as this will assist in protecting the amenity of residential areas by ensuring dwellings are not crammed in and will provide a sense of space.	The submitter supports all changes currently proposed and would like these to remain.	No	
28	5.1.3.2B	They support the new open space requirement and believe that residents who require no open space have the option of apartment dwellings.	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
30	5.1.3.2B	The submitter strongly supports the ... open space requirement given experiences of infill housing in their local neighbourhood.	That the Council note the submitters concerns about infill housing and the lack of concern for current property owners.	No	
31	5.1.3.2B	The submitter does recognise that changes need to be made on this issue, but notes concerns with ... the open space requirement...	That the Council note the concerns of the submitter.	Unknown	
33	5.1.3.2B	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space): supported, but how will this be monitored?	No	
37	5.1.3.2B	The submitter supports PC 56, in particular ... Rule 5.1.3.2.B (open space). This support stems from concern that an adjoining property may be developed which will create privacy issues.	To note the support of this submitter for provisions 5.1.3.4.3 and 5.1.3.2B.	Unknown	
38	5.1.3.2B	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change	Rule 5.1.3.2B: requirement to remove parking or manoeuvring areas from open space limits permissible density of development beyond the permitted site coverage rule and should not be adopted.	Yes	
46	5.1.3.2B	The submitter opposes the open space requirement (5.1.3.2.B) and instead suggests a density limit of dwellings per site area.	That the Committee consider the elements of opposition and introduce a density limit of dwellings per site area.	No	
48	5.1.3.2B	The submitter makes comments on the reasonableness of ... the minimum width requirement of the open space areas (5.1.3.2B).	That the minimum width of the outdoor area in Outer Residential Areas be reduced to 3m to allow greater flexibility in the placement of infill housing.	Unknown	
51	5.1.3.2B	The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.	Rule 5.1.3.2B: request 40m ² for outer residential areas and 30m ² for inner residential areas, both of good design is more than sufficient for multi-unit developments. Do not prescribe that the open space area must be lawn as lawn can become unusable in winter. In respect of 5.1.3.2B.7, why can't buildings be included in this?	No	
55	5.1.3.2B	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.3.2B: open space	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	

58	5.1.3.2B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3.2B (Open Space): provisions are extremely confusing and overly complicated. Use the 'coverage site area" as a guide. Agree that open space could be shared/aggregated. We would like all decks (covered or uncovered) to be counted as exterior amenity and therefore open space (subject to rules 5.1.3.2.5A and 5.3.5.1-9).	Yes	
59	5.1.3.2B	The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous: Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space).	That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.	Yes	
62	5.1.3.2B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3.2B (Open Space): provisions are extremely confusing and overly complicated. Use the 'coverage site area" as a guide. Agree that open space could be shared/aggregated. We would like all decks (covered or uncovered) to be counted as exterior amenity and therefore open space (subject to rules 5.1.3.2.5A and 5.3.5.1-9).	Yes	
63	5.1.3.2B	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3.2B (Open Space): provisions are extremely confusing and overly complicated. Use the 'coverage site area" as a guide. Agree that open space could be shared/aggregated. We would like all decks (covered or uncovered) to be counted as exterior amenity and therefore open space (subject to rules 5.1.3.2.5A and 5.3.5.1-9).	Yes	
66	5.1.3.2B	The submitter strongly supports plan change 56, in particular rule 5.1.3.2B (open space requirement) as this will encourage more gardens and...	That the Committee note the support of the submitter.	Unknown	
67	5.1.3.2B	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.1.3.2B: seek amendments to the rules to ensure greater consistency with the Residential Design Guide and between the two residential areas. Seek that all vacant lots that existed before notification of this rule be exempt from the rule. That manoeuvring areas can be included within the open space allocation, or reduce the amount of open space required to 35m ² (draft wording supplied).	Yes	
69	5.1.3.2B	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Rule 5.1.3.2B: The implications of providing this area of open space with a minimum dimension of 4m do not seem to have been fully considered. Greater flexibility is sought to provisions 5.1.3.2B.2 and 5.1.3.2B.7 (draft wording supplied).	Yes	
70	5.1.3.2B	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.1.3.2B: shared open space in the Inner Residential Area should be larger (60m ² – 100m ²) is much more usable and provides greater opportunity for a multiple of users. Any open space should not be on the south side of any property or subject to a natural hazard.	Yes	
72	5.1.3.2B	The submitter opposes three key rules in PC 56 as well as the associated objectives and policies.	Delete Rule 5.1.3.2B (Open space) and any associated wording changes to the objectives and policies relating to these provisions.	Yes	

76	5.1.3.2B	The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. Particular support is given to ... including the new open space rule (5.1.3.2B) ...	Approve Plan Change 57	Yes	
84	5.1.3.2B	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Outdoor space: steep sites cannot be achieve unless on decks.	Yes	
84	5.1.3.2B	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Rule 5.1.3.2B: suggest 50m ² for first house, 40m ² for second house and 30m ² for third house.	Yes	
85	5.1.3.2B	The submitter does not support Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) or Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space) as the existing residential rules for bulk and location are adequate.	The submitter seeks that the existing residential rules be retained as the proposed plan change will not necessarily improve the quality of infill housing and will instead discourage infill housing and make cost of housing less affordable.	No	
44	5.1.3.2B	Seek numerous changes to the wording of this rule	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	5.1.3.2B	Some minor wording changes to the rule	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
2	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter supports the Plan Change, in particular ... the imposition of a one storey height provision. The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.	That the plan change rules are supported	No	
4	5.1.3.4.3	Similarly limiting the height of a second dwelling to 4.5m is unrealistic as most of Wellington's sections are clopping in nature and excessive excavation can lead to bigger problems.	Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly.	Unknown	
10	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes the provisions especially the height limit .. and the manner in which the plan change was implemented. The Submitter considers the plan change will stifle city growth, push land prices up, encourage urban sprawl and the proliferation of tiny single level dwellings. The plan change has wide ranging effect that has not been well thought out and cuts across citizens property rights.	That the Council fully consult with not only residents that don't want change but industry and those that wish to live in areas affected to develop a reasonable approach.	Yes	
12	5.1.3.4.3	The Submitter approves the restriction of a second dwelling to 4.5m and states that they understand the new rules will limit the use of excavation that allows developers to build high and meet the height planes.	Adopt the plan change in its entirety.	No	
13	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes the provision to reduce the permitted height of a second unit to 4.5m. The submitter believes that Wellington's topography plus the smallish size of many infill sites would make development of those sites impractical if a 4.5m height is imposed. The submitter notes that most dwellings in Wellington are not single storey and is concerned that the proposal will encourage urban sprawl and a consequential increase in motor use.	That the Council amend the proposal to restore the current rules on permitted heights and remove the 4.5m restriction.	No	

14	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter supports tighter controls on subdivision as well as the design guide, the reduction of the permitted height for the second unit on a site and the open space requirements.	Reduce the permitted height of 2 nd unit on a site to 4.5m.	No	
16	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter cites concerns relating to an infill development adjacent to theirs and notes that infill housing should not be substandard and should be single storey houses or units which do not obstruct the sun from existing properties.	That infill housing should be single storey houses or units.	No	
19	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter suggests amendments to the 4.5m height rule for second units on a site stating that consideration needs to be given to topography where a single dwelling may not be practical from a design perspective or meet the demand created by the changing demographics or unique characteristics of Wellington.	Recognition that "one size does not fit all" in Wellington City because of the compact nature of the geographical area and the unique features that are characteristic of our housing. Decisions about infill housing in the future should recognise topographic differences within the city.		
21	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter would like height restrictions on new dwellings especially where they could block sun and views to existing neighbours and the submitter supports greater discretion in the subdivision process to ensure better quality outcomes.	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
22	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter also supports the proposed rule to limit the height of a second unit on a site, stating this is especially important because of Wellington's topography. The submitter accepts that property purchases accept the effects of existing dwellings that may overlook a property, but suggests that the construction of new double storey infill dwellings can adversely affect properties (eg. privacy, visual dominance and shading). Neighbours need to have the opportunity to raise their concerns regarding new dwellings greater than 4.5m in height.	The submitter supports all changes currently proposed and would like these to remain.	No	
27	5.1.3.4.3	The submitters support the proposals to limit the height and site coverage of developments in residential areas.	We want the Council to limit the height and site coverage of buildings in residential areas (without consent).	Yes	
29	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: remove this rule (height of second unit) and make any consequential changes. Consider its wider implications as part of Targeted Approach to Infill. If the rule remains add additional assessment criteria regarding the ability of the proposal to meet Wellington's housing needs.	Yes	
30	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter strongly supports the reduction of the bulk and scale of infill housing ... given experiences of infill housing in their local neighbourhood.	That the Council note the submitters concerns about infill housing and the lack of concern for current property owners.	No	
31	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter does recognise that changes need to be made on this issue, but notes concerns with the height of the second unit rule...	That the Council note the concerns of the submitter.	Unknown	

32	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes the proposed bulk and location rules (in particular rule 5.1.3.4.3) as it will mean fewer developments will fit within the rules.	That the rules state an order of preference (ie is sunlight more important than privacy). Environment is more important than aesthetics. It should not be possible to override the environment by making the project look nice.	Yes	
33	5.1.3.4.3	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	5.1.3.4.3 (height of 2 nd unit) and associated rule (5.3.4b): strongly supported.	No	
35	5.1.3.4.3	Other provisions supported include rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of 2 nd unit)...	That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter.	Yes	
36	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter supports PC 56, in particular ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of 2 nd unit).	To make the suggested change to DP 56 .	No	
37	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter supports PC 56, in particular rules 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) This support stems from concern that an adjoining property may be developed which will create privacy issues.	To note the support of this submitter for provisions 5.1.3.4.3 and 5.1.3.2B.	Unknown	
38	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: The 4.5m height restriction is onerous and cannot be justified at all in any of Wellington' numerous hilly suburbs. If adopted, it should only apply to the flat suburbs with predominantly single storey dwellings, not the whole city.	Yes	
39	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change, but notes some issues that require further modification. These include ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) especially in respect of building on hillsides.	For Rule 5.1.3.4.3: the rules should allow some flexibility or be modified to better address the situation on hillside sites. It would help if the rule, rather than limiting developments to a maximum height of 4.5m, limited buildings to single storey with a maximum height above floor level of, say 4m.	Unknown	
46	5.1.3.4.3	Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) is also opposed due to the many steep sites making the rule restrictive.	That the Committee consider the elements of opposition.	No	
48	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter makes comments on the reasonableness of rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) and ...	That a proposed reduction of 2.6m from the existing 8m height limit to 5.4m would effectively reduce the height limit by one storey, while still making it more workable than the proposed 4.5m on sloping sites.	Unknown	
52	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter strongly supports the following rules and policies: 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B, rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit).	That the Council design and make compulsory laws/regulations to ensure that infill housing (in neighbourhoods that have the majority of their housing in single dwelling, or only two single storey dwellings per property) reflects the character of the neighbourhood and does not affect the quality of current residents' lifestyles with regard to sunlight, privacy, over crowding or noise.	Yes	
55	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) and rule 5.3.4b.	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	

56	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an 'Infill Household Unit' and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.	Amend the wording of 5.1.3.4.3 so that the word 'second' is replaced with the word 'infill'. (draft wording supplied)	Yes	
56	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an 'Infill Household Unit' and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.	Include an advice note after rule 5.1.3.4.3 to indicate that: "for the avoidance of doubt multi-unit development of three or more dwellings requiring resource consent from Rule 5.3.4, 5.4.6 or 5.4.8 are not subject to this 4.5m height restriction on their second or third household units."	Yes	
58	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit): "This clause seems to be a sledge hammer cracking a peanut". We suggest that the residential design guide be used instead to protect privacy as a controlled use assessment criteria.	Yes	
59	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous: Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit)	That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.	Yes	
62	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit): "This clause seems to be a sledge hammer cracking a peanut". We suggest that the residential design guide be used instead to protect privacy as a controlled use assessment criteria.	Yes	
63	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit): "This clause seems to be a sledge hammer cracking a peanut". We suggest that the residential design guide be used instead to protect privacy as a controlled use assessment criteria.	Yes	
64	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter notes particular concerns over two provisions, being ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) and the consequential pressure it may place on development in Suburban Centre Areas.	Re: Suburban Centres – the introduction (very soon) of rules applying to the Suburban Centre that more specifically address the effects on adjoining residential areas of "permitted maximum infill developments" of suburban centre areas.	Yes	
65	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: Height of second unit rule is unreasonable and impractical due to Wellington's topography.	Yes	
66	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter strongly supports plan change 56, ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) to ensure privacy.	That the Committee note the support of the submitter.	Unknown	

67	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: That the rule be deleted or at least modified to take into account the physical characteristics of building on sloping sites. Concerns how this rule will work with future earthworks rules. Note that concern stems from where the height of buildings are measured from. Suggest that the 8m height limit be taken from the ground floor level for proposed buildings on the excavated parts of the building platform (rather than existing ground level or assessed ground level). This would avoid the ability of people being able to gain extra building height by undertaking earthworks. creating 3 storey dwellings in some areas.	Yes	
69	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: Delete this rule as the 4.5m height limit is very restrictive even for flat sites and extremely difficult on sloping sites. Likely to encourage stepped houses on sloped sites with rooftop decks and mono-pitched roves. If the rule isn't deleted, consider instead a rule similar to the 'deck in side boundary rule' (5.1.3.1.5A) which controls the location of habitable room windows in the vicinity of a boundary (draft wording supplied). Also note that the reference to 1000m ² site in this rule should be 800m ² to be consistent with assessment criteria 5.3.14.11.	Yes	
70	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: a 4.5m height restriction is likely to be impractical on slopes in excess of 22.5 degrees. Consideration could be given to allowing higher buildings on steeper slopes if earthworks are to be minimised.	Yes	
70	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.1.3.4.3 and link to clause 5.3.4.4 and the non-notification statements needs further checking as these references seems irrelevant.	Yes	
71	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).	Rule 5.1.3.4.3: should make it clear it applies to sites where the existing dwelling is or will be demolished, ie. infill housing should not proceed on the basis that a second unit can be constructed to 8m if the existing property is or has to be removed.	Yes	
72	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes three key rules in PC 56 as well as the associated objectives and policies.	Delete Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second dwelling) and consequential rules (5.3.3.3, 5.3.4B and assessment criteria) and any associated wording changes to the objectives and policies relating to these provisions.	Yes	
77	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter disagrees with rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) being restricted to a single storey. There is a contradiction in that there should be minimum open space which becomes impossible to meet depending on building size and section area.	That the restriction (rule 5.1.3.4.3) be amended so that two storeys or more should be allowed to achieve the minimum open space requirements and in keeping with the neighbourhood.	Yes	

78	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur ... particular mention is made of rule 5.1.3.4.3.	That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.	Yes	
79	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur ... particular mention is made of rule 5.1.3.4.3.	That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.	Yes	
84	5.1.3.4.3	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Steep sites need a whole different set of rules than flat sites. Privacy cannot always be achieved on hillsides when outdoor spaces overlook other properties.	Yes	
85	5.1.3.4.3	The submitter does not support Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) or Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space) as the existing residential rules for bulk and location are adequate.	The submitter seeks that the existing residential rules be retained as the proposed plan change will not necessarily improve the quality of infill housing and will instead discourage infill housing and make cost of housing less affordable.	No	
47	5.1.3.4.3	Support this rule	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	
44	5.1.3.4.3	Is this height limit measured from above mean sea level? And seek further clarification for the explanatory text to this rule.	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	5.1.3.4.3	Seeks clarification of how the rule would apply if all neighbouring houses are two storey. Adding a single storey as a permitted activity would disrupt the character.	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
23	5.1.3A	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Existing uses permitted activity rule: Clarification is required to explain what happens to applications that do not meet the permitted activity standards for this rule. A margin note is suggested to clarify the process.	No	
29	5.1.3A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Rule 5.1.3A: Supports rule so seeks its retention.	Yes	
39	5.1.3A	The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change, but notes some issues that require further modification. These include the new permitted activity rule for existing uses (5.1.3A) and ...	For rule 5.1.3A: allow the status quo to apply to existing non-complying buildings, and that additions and alterations to those buildings to be 'permitted activities' provided that the work does not worsen the non-compliance and preferably reduces the level of non-compliance.	Unknown	
50	5.1.3A	The submitter supports plan change 56 as a positive step towards improving the quality of infill housing. However the submitter has particular concerns with proposed new rule 5.1.3A (existing uses permitted activity standard), particularly that it does not make provision for sites that exceed site coverage to be within the scope of the rule.	That rule 5.1.3A be amended to allow site coverage (5.1.3.3) to be considered within the scope of the rule, alongside yards, maximum height and sunlight access.	Yes	

55	5.1.3A	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.3A: existing uses permitted activity standard, specifically 4.5m height restriction for additions.	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	
58	5.1.3A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.	Yes	
62	5.1.3A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.	Yes	
63	5.1.3A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.	Yes	
65	5.1.3A	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Rule 5.1.3A: Oppose this rule as it goes too far. At the very least it should be reworded to only apply where the existing dwelling is not already two stories.	Yes	
67	5.1.3A	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.1.3A: generally support the rule, but seek some minor wording amendments (draft wording supplied).	Yes	
76	5.1.3A	The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. A detailed submission is made on Rule 5.1.3A relating to existing uses, which outlines the history of that provision from the submitter's perspective.	Rule 5.1.3A: strongly supports this rule in principle but recommends rewording for clarity (draft wording supplied). Changes are specifically recommended to the title of the rule, 5.1.3A.2, 5.1.3A.2b and 5.1.3A.4.	Yes	
84	5.1.3A	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Rule 5.1.3A: concerned that this rule may be interpreted as meaning ascetic. A modern well design addition can still be sympathetic to the existing building.	Yes	
47	5.1.3A	Support sentiment of rule, but it prescribes the footprint as being exempt and that elevation and section of existing building are not exempt.	Strongly suggest that the term "footprint" is added to the use of "envelope" -(draft wording for 5.1.3A.2 supplied).	Unknown	
44	5.1.3A	Definition needed for "existing building footprint".	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	5.1.3A	Corrects typing error	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	

Discretionary Restricted Residential Rules (includes infill and multi-unit rule, subdivision)

44	5.3.1	Seek definition of what is meant by "streetscape".	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
23	5.3.3	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Open Space Provisions: early implementation of these provisions has revealed a need for the planners to have greater flexibility in dealing with waivers of the open space requirement. It is proposed that Policy 4.2.3.1A and the assessment criteria in Rule 5.3.3 be amended to provide greater discretion. Such discretion would be expanded to cover the situation where the application has been fully assessed against the Residential Design Guide by the Council's urban designers and the proposal receives a very favourable urban design assessment, ie. an excellent design concept for the development along with high quality private open spaces (though less than what the rule requires) can still meet the intent of the policy. Two other minor wording changes to the rule are also proposed for further clarity.	No	
33	5.3.3	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	5.3.3.11-12: supported for the greater clarity provided.	No	
67	5.3.3	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.3.3: correct reference in 5.3.3.3 to 5.1.4.3.4 to read 5.1.3.4.3. In 5.3.3.7 replace reference to Multi-unit design guide with Residential Design Guide. Seek that this rule, or another rule, make provisions for non-notification with no service requirement for failure to meet open space requirements where scale of development is consistent with surrounding residential area (draft wording supplied). Amend wording of assessment criteria 5.3.3.11-5.3.3.13 as these are too subjective (draft wording supplied).	Yes	
69	5.3.3	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Rule 5.3.3: amend the reference under 5.3.3.3 to 5.1.4.3.4 to read 5.1.3.4.3. Also include a sentence in criterion 5.3.3.12 which advises applicants what size of open space will be considered by Council to be large enough to not require neighbours approval.	Yes	
44	5.3.3	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	5.3.3	wording addition sought to 5.3.3.13	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
23	5.3.3.3	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Correction: correct an incorrect reference to 5.1.4.3.4 found in rule 5.3.3.3 so that it reads 5.1.3.4.3.	No	

29	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.	Rule 5.3.4: add additional assessment criteria regarding the ability of the proposal to meet Wellington's housing needs.	Yes
33	5.3.4	The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.	5.3.4.6 and 5.3.4.7: also strongly supported.	No
55	5.3.4	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Assessment criteria for rule 5.3.4a and 5.3.4b, 5.3.10	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes
57	5.3.4	The submitter seeks some wording amendments to three parts of the plan change to acknowledge that neighbours, other than immediately adjoining neighbours, can be affected by infill developments and secondly the loss of sound amenity (through increased noise) is also a valid effect that needs consideration.	5.3.4.6: At the end of criterion before 'to adjoining sites', the words "or significant increase in noise levels" be added.	No
58	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Believe that the perceived problems that initiated PC56 is more a problem with multi-unit developments than adding a second unit. Use the "controlled use" assessment criteria for second household units so that they are treated differently from multi-unit developments.	Yes
58	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.	Yes
62	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Believe that the perceived problems that initiated PC56 is more a problem with multi-unit developments than adding a second unit. Use the "controlled use" assessment criteria for second household units so that they are treated differently from multi-unit developments.	Yes
62	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.	Yes
63	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Believe that the perceived problems that initiated PC56 is more a problem with multi-unit developments than adding a second unit. Use the "controlled use" assessment criteria for second household units so that they are treated differently from multi-unit developments.	Yes

63	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.	Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.	Yes	
65	5.3.4	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Rule 5.3.4b: Seek that the 7m height limit in the standards and terms of this rule be revised to 8m to be consistent with the existing maximum height provisions.	Yes	
67	5.3.4	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.3.4a and 5.3.4b: amend drafting of non-notification statement and standards and terms (in particular change the 7m height limit in S&T to be 8m plus the 1m pitched roof allowance [draft wording supplied]).	Yes	
69	5.3.4	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Rule 5.3.4B: amend the standard and terms for this rule to allow the height of buildings to be 8m "plus the 1m gable end allowance".	Yes	
70	5.3.4	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.3.4: standards and terms limiting height to 7m should extend to 8m.	Yes	
71	5.3.4	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).	Residential Design Guide and Rule 5.3.4.7: the Plan should recognise that the view from existing houses is as significant an issue related to amenity value as being overlooked by new developments. Amend rule 5.3.4.7 to provide a reference to the 'blocking of significant existing viewshafts". Include this also in the commentary on the rule.	Yes	
84	5.3.4	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Rule 5.3.4.11: (kerb side parking): admirable provision but how it is to be monitored?	Yes	
44	5.3.4	Support, but seek some changes to the notification statement and the standards and terms to provide clarity	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	5.3.4	Some minor wording changes to the rule	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
64	5.3.4.10	The submitter notes particular concerns over two provisions, being the consideration of vegetation removed prior to subdivision and ...	Reconsideration of the "2 year" reference in relation to the removal of trees and vegetation prior to infill subdivision/development.	Yes	
65	5.3.4.10	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	5.3.4.10 and 5.3.4.11: oppose these provisions (assessment of the removal of trees) as being not fair or reasonable to retrospectively penalise someone for removing trees as a permitted activity or where those trees have been removed by a previous owner.	Yes	

69	5.3.4.10	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Assessment Criteria 5.3.4.9 and 5.3.4.10: Delete criterion 5.3.4.10, as the requirement to provide a landscaping plan and criterion 5.3.4.9 is sufficient to manage the effects of new development.	Yes	
9	5.3.4.12	Policy 4.2.4.1/Rule 5.3.4.12. Notes the overlooking adjacent properties might be mitigated by placing new dwellings obliquely or at an angle.	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
11	5.3.4.7	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.	Seeks that privacy is protected at all costs as it is something most Kiwis hold very personal.	No	
38	5.3.10	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change	Landscaping requirements: should only be applied where specific measures of mitigation are required. Assessment criterion 5.3.10.11 should be deleted as it is unworkable.	Yes	
44	5.3.10	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	5.3.10	Some minor wording changes to the rule	That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56	Yes	
69	5.3.10.	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Assessment Criteria 5.3.10.9 and 5.3.10.12. Delete 5.3.10.12 as it overlaps with 5.3.10.9.	Yes	
44	5.3.11	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
3	5.3.14	The submitter is concerned about the way the proposed provisions (particularly the subdivision requirements) will affect the conversion of existing cross lease arrangements to fee simple titles. As such conversions are subdivisions the submitter would like provisions in the Plan to protect the rights of owners of cross lease properties who wish to convert these to fee simple titles. Existing dwellings on these sites already have Council approval and the plan change should not make it more onerous that it is presently to convert such cross lease titles.	That the plan change include a specific exclusion from the proposed changes to prevent the changes having any unintended consequences for cross lease property owners who wish to convert to fee simple titles.	No	
8	5.3.14	The submitter does not agree with the proposed subdivision rules for the following reasons. 1. The rules will mean an end to any subdivision in the greater Wellington area. The imposition of the 35% coverage and 4.5m height rules will mean nobody with an averaged sized section of 700sq.m will be able to build another house on it because the value of the second house will be outweighed by the costs of the subdivision/building project. 2. The 'protection of the character of Wellington City' is not a plausible rationale for the proposal because the inner city areas are already subdivided. 3. Preventing subdivision and infilling of northern suburbs will not change the current image of the city. 4. The proposal represents a cynical and unwarranted intrusion into property rights and its effect will only push house prices higher.	That the Council notes the concerns of the submitter in making its decision, particularly in respect of the proposed changes to the subdivision provisions.	Unknown	

14	5.3.14	The submitter supports tighter controls on subdivision as well as the design guide, the reduction of the permitted height for the second unit on a site and the open space requirements.	Tighter controls on subdivisions and the design guide	No	
35	5.3.14	Other provisions supported include ... rule 5.3.14 (subdivision assessed against the residential design guide).	That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter.	Yes	
42	5.3.14	The submitter considers the Council is taking a wrong step with the proposed new subdivision rules. The rules should be softer not more difficult. ... Concerned this will force people further and further away from Wellington and in turn putting pressure on transport infrastructure.	That the committee note the concerns of the submitter and make the subdivision rules more lenient (eg. site coverage 50%)	Unknown	
43	5.3.14	The submitter supports the plan change but believes that minimum lot sizes should be reintroduced due to the current rule based planning not meeting the expectation of providing a high standard of infill development. Rule 5.3.3, 5.4.5, policy 4.2.4.1 and the amended design guide for subdivision are acknowledged, but concern remains that without a concrete minimum lot size the status quo will continue.	Minimum lot size be reintroduced	Yes	
55	5.3.14	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Deletion of the controlled activity subdivision rules (5.2.5A and b) and replacement by rule 5.3.14	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	
55	5.3.14	The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Assessment criteria in rule 5.3.14, especially 5.3.14.11.	That plan change 56 not be approved.	Yes	
65	5.3.14	The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted	Rule 5.3.14: There should be a controlled activity rule that allows for subdivisions that create allotments of over 400m ² , where a permitted activity dwelling will comply with the lot. There are some instances where a minimum lot size would be useful and make the subdivision process more straight forward.	Yes	
67	5.3.14	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.2.5A and 5.2.5B (Controlled Activity Subdivision rules – deleted from PC56): concerned with the loss of controlled activity subdivision and seek that it be retained, but acknowledge the only way to do so is to introduce a minimum area or shape factor as this will provide Council with the level of assurance it appears to seek. If minimum area adopted, recommend 350m ² - 400m ² . Controlled activity subdivisions will work well for cross lease and unit title situations, for boundary adjustments (that do not create new non-compliances or for vacant lots greater than say 350-400m ²) and for subdivision around existing buildings where the permitted activity conditions in rule 5.1.11 cannot be met.	Yes	

67	5.3.14	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.3.14: seek the retention of earthworks as a matter for discretion. Drafting of standards and terms requires some minor changes (draft wording supplied). Delete reference in 5.3.14.12 to a minimum lot size figure (400m ²), or if the figure remains a more realistic figure would be 350m ² . Concerns about subjective and leading nature of 5.3.14.13.	Yes	
69	5.3.14	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Assessment Criterion 5.3.14.13: Delete this, or at least rewrite to reflect the fact that infill housing is a desirable activity which has benefits to the city.	Yes	
69	5.3.14	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	Rule 5.3.14 (b): retain cross-lease and unit title subdivision around consented and existing buildings as Controlled Activities as these subdivisions are simply a method of space allocation and do not change land use patterns. Where a combined landuse and unit title subdivision is being considered, the submitter suggests that a Standard and Term be placed in the Controlled Activity rule that requires landuse consent to be obtained to the development. Where consent is not granted for the building, a subdivision consent under rule 5.4.5 is proposed.	Yes	
69	5.3.14	The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.	New Controlled Activity Rule for Boundary Adjustments: Add a new rule to provide controlled activity status for boundary adjustments that do not create vacant allotments or increase the degree of non-compliance for existing buildings.	Yes	
70	5.3.14	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.3.14: note that one assessment criteria refers to a lot size of 400m ² . Suggest that it is not lot size that is important but rather lot shape so suggest introduction of a shape factor as a guide to the development potential of new lots.	Yes	
71	5.3.14	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).	Notes that while there is no minimum lot size stated in the Plan the rules seem to indicate that the adverse effects may be generated on sites less than 400m ² . The Plan should include a minimum lot size to control such effects; 300m ² is proposed. Alternatively, amend the open space rules to require 80m ² (rule 5.1.3.2B.6) and reduce site coverage to 30% (maximum of 35% where it includes an uncovered deck) (rule 5.1.3.3.2).	Yes	
72	5.3.14	The submitter opposes three key rules in PC 56 as well as the associated objectives and policies.	Seeks the reinstatement of rule 5.2.5a and b (controlled activity subdivision rules) due to the opposition of proposed subdivision rule 5.3.14 and Any associated wording changes to the objectives and policies relating to these provisions.	Yes	

74	5.3.14	The submitters support the plan change which regulates the size and shape of new infill housing. The submitters are particularly concerned that new subdivisions on unstable hillsides, which will increase the number of dwellings, will only accentuate potential instability.	That new limits on the amount of dwellings within an area of land be required to reduce destabilisation.	Unknown	
75	5.3.14	The submitter focuses on aspects of the plan change that need greater emphasis, including the environmental impacts of infill (eg. city green corridors, existing watersheds, amenity value of greenscape, quality and durability of buildings, the living quality of people).	The consideration of these environmental effects should be in the context of subdivision and residential building standards as well as the city greenscape/watershed management.	No	
47	5.3.14	Strongly support proposal that subdivisions are Discretionary (Restricted) Activities.	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	
44	5.3.14	Interested and affected parties should be notified of any intent for an applicant to seek subdivision consent regardless of whether the consent will be publicly notified. Seek some changes to the assessment criteria, and clarification around some terms. Would like the Code of Practice for Land Development referred to.	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
24	5.3.14.8	The submitter seeks amendments in relation to rule 5.3.14.8 regarding the need for greater consideration of storm water capacity to cope with additional infill housing.	That the following specific concerns are added to Plan Change 56. 1. That appropriate stormwater drainage has sufficient cubic capacity to service additional apartments or flats added to an original one home property. 2. If it does not, that an appropriate secondary flow path is reserved. 3. That all new apartments or flats added have a water toby with access for the Council on nearby Council land (for accurate water metering charges if they occur).	No	
Discretionary Unrestricted Residential Rules (specifically subdivision)					
38	5.4.5	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change	Assessment Criterion 5.4.5.2B: delete as it is unworkable.	Yes	
67	5.4.5	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Rule 5.4.5: suggest minor changes to assessment criteria to remove subjective nature of drafting.	Yes	
70	5.4.5	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Rule 5.4.5: Clarify how a restricted discretionary subdivision can become an unrestricted discretionary activity. Believe that subdivision of a site should not be any more restrictive that any land use consent needed for activities on a site.	Yes	
44	5.4.5	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
Comments on Notification Provisions					

2	Notification	The submitter supports the Plan Change ... The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.	Including a real not nominal notification requirement (prior to the granting of any consents or amending any rating status) so that those adjacent property holders and others in the immediate vicinity have any opportunity to comment/object to the proposal; and Where all the immediate adjoining neighbours do not agree, the infill housing proposal will not be granted Council consent to proceed.	No	
5	Notification	Submitter supports the intent of the proposed rules, but argues that the process is flawed. That is, where the decision making is delegated with no right of recourse to an independent third party such as the Environment Court, it is unlikely that the quality of infill housing will be maintained over time. Developers will end up capturing the process with more incremental additions to the "permitted baseline" resulting in further adversely affected party exclusion and alienation from the process.	That the Council approve Plan Change 56 with the following amendments: 1. Any proposed infill housing development that involves more than two units or a maximum of two storeys be subject to limited notification to directly adjoining properties unless effected party consent forms are held by the applicants from these parties; and 2. Notification to potentially adversely affected parties be required for any infill housing proposal where the development is 4 dwellings or more; or 3 dwellings or more with more than two storeys.	No	
11	Notification	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.	Requests the rules be amended so that every infill or subdivision is notified to immediate neighbours. The submitter is concerned that landowners spend significant time and money getting their properties they way they like them and yet the Council gives developers the right to ruin their living standards.	No	
12	Notification	Concerns were also raised at the number of infill developments that have proceeded without notification.	Consider widening the scope of notification of infill developments to ensure affected owners have some input into the consent process.	No	
18	Notification	The submitter fully supports limiting the height of the second unit to single storey, introducing open space requirements for each dwelling, tightening subdivision controls and introducing requirements for visitor car parking. The submitter cites two examples of developments in his neighbourhood to support his submission.	That the Council introduce robust and sensible rules for infill housing and maintain those standards by not giving dispensations without proper consultation with affected neighbours. The Submitter seeks that such dispensations be given by council committees and not Council officers.	Unknown	
27	Notification	The submitters support the proposals to limit the height and site coverage of developments in residential areas. The submitters cite an infill development adjacent to their homes as being the reason for a supportive submission.	That the Council stop people being able to develop sites in this way without the consent or discussion with those who will be affected by the developments.	Yes	
35	Notification	Other provisions supported include ... the notification statement of all multi-unit resource consent applications.	That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter.	Yes	
43	Notification	Residential amenity policy 4.2.2.1A and B and the residential design guide are supported, as is rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit).	Breaching of the 4.5m height rule for infill housing should be subject to limited notification.	Yes	

71	Notification	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).	Notification thresholds: the plan change should clearly spell out when notification or limited notification is required. Limited notification should at least be required when one rule is exceeded and consent of the affected party(s) is not obtained and general notification when two or more rules are exceeded and the consent of affect parties not obtained. A minimum lot threshold would provide a clear expectation of when notification would be required for infill housing in the Outer Residential Area.	Yes	
84	Notification	General concerns are noted with the design assessment process (which seems to have significant discretion for Council designers in interpreting the design guide). It is unclear in many cases whether neighbours will be required to give approval for minor non-compliance even if the urban designers support the application. The amount of say by neighbours should be minimised as minor encroachments can often lead to much better design outcomes.	Note comments	Yes	
Volume 2: Design Guides					
12	Residential Design Guide		Clarify how the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides will be used, ie what is their status in respect of the Plan objectives and rules?	No	
23	Residential Design Guide	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Link between subdivision and Residential Design Guide: It is recognised that to require at the time of subdivision consents a complete assessment of the work against the Residential Design Guide is excessive. It is suggested that the reference to the Residential Design Guide in section 5.3.14.13 be amended so that it refers to "Section 1 of the residential Design Guide (ie. Building form, location and site planning)".	No	
31	Residential Design Guide	The submitter does recognise that changes need to be made on this issue, but notes concerns with the ... the Residential Design Guide (which is extremely prescriptive).	That the Council note the concerns of the submitter.	Unknown	
35	Residential Design Guide	The residential design guide is also supported as it restores its effectiveness in deciding the appropriate size and character of multiunit developments.	That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter.	Yes	
38	Residential Design Guide	The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change	Residential Design Guide: should be amended to recognise that it is ultra vires to control activity on a site where that activity does not have an effect on the properties outside the site or where neighbours have given written approval.	Yes	
39	Residential Design Guide	The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change, but notes some issues that require further modification. Concerns about the requirement in the Residential Design Guide for open space areas to be flat also presents problems for hilly sites.	Note concerns	Unknown	

59	Residential Design Guide	The submitter notes that the multi-unit design guide as it exists provides all the necessary tools to control building quality, scale and amenities.	That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.	Yes	
70	Residential Design Guide	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Residential Design Guide: considered more appropriate guide than the previous multi-unit design guide. If anything, encourage the use of more diagrams.	Yes	
71	Residential Design Guide	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).	Residential Design Guide and Rule 5.3.4.7: the Plan should recognise that the view from existing houses is as significant an issue related to amenity value as being overlooked by new developments. Amend rule 5.3.4.7 to provide a reference to the 'blocking of significant existing viewshafts". Include this also in the commentary on the rule.	Yes	
73	Residential Design Guide	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change but does identify certain issues that need to be addressed.	The changes to the Residential Design Guide provisions need care wording to ensure they do not undermine the existing protections for character and streetscape.	Yes	
78	Residential Design Guide	Concerned also at the increase in consent applications that will require assessment against the Residential Design Guide, which on past experience, indicates that the guidelines will end up being 'must comply with' rather than just guidelines and further delay consent processing timeframes.	That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.	Yes	
79	Residential Design Guide	Concerned also at the increase in consent applications that will require assessment against the Residential Design Guide, which on past experience, indicates that the guidelines will end up being 'must comply with' rather than just guidelines and further delay consent processing timeframes.	That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.	Yes	
84	Residential Design Guide	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Reference to north facing windows: note that the building sites within existing city boundaries are becoming more difficult to build on and this may be difficult to fulfil. Spell out skylights as an option to ensure they are accepted.	Yes	
84	Residential Design Guide	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Change the winter sun into courtyard to mid summer/mid winter sun.	Yes	
84	Residential Design Guide	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Residential Design Guide: greater site coverage for single storey or low profile developments and allow reduced outdoor space for townhouse developments.	Yes	
47	Residential Design Guide	Title of Residential Design Guide inaccurately implies that it covers a wide range of residential buildings.	The Guide needs to be made more relevant to apartment design (3-4 storey developments) in the inner city to ensure good design for all residences.	Unknown	
47	Residential Design	Support wording on page 3 regarding 'Design Flexibility and responsiveness to site' and 'relevance'.	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	

	Guide				
47	Residential Design Guide	G1.11, G1.14, G3.8: a picturesque strategy of variation, asymmetry and breaking up of large forms is preferred over symmetrical, formal and larger blocks (considered visually dominant 'evil').	This ignores the possibility that well-proportioned and well-detailed design of larger buildings might be appropriate in some circumstances. Similarly, concerned about comments relating to material variation as sculptural moulding and shaping space are also valid strategies. The guide should discuss roof planes (ie variance in roof planes) as these can be a dominant and monotonous repetitive feature in domestic architecture.	Unknown	
47	Residential Design Guide	G2.2: Support this guideline.	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	
47	Residential Design Guide	G3.10: query the significance of extending the planting and landscape patterns that characterise the wider setting.	That the Council support more sophisticated ideas of engaging with site context.	Unknown	
47	Residential Design Guide	G2.3: Tends to imply that orientation to the street is more important than orientation to the sun.	That the Residential Design Guide make it explicit that orientation to the street must not be at the expense of orientation to the sun and that this guide does not necessarily require buildings to be aligned parallel to the street if better results are found with other alignments.	Unknown	
47	Residential Design Guide	G3.16: Service facilities	We consider that recycling bins should be accommodated wherever there is a space requirement for rubbish bins.	Unknown	
47	Residential Design Guide	G2.9: do not support need for "secure weatherproof storage area or cupboard....". Inappropriate level of detail for the Council to require.	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	
44	Residential Design Guide	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
83	Residential Design Guide	The submitter has supplied a detailed outline of changes sought to various provisions of the plan change, as well as an assessment of the Residential Design Guide which outlines the guidelines are demonstrably focused on 'externalities' compared with those that seek to control 'internal amenity effects'.	That the Council review and revise the Residential Design Guide to focus more on the externalities.	Yes	
12	Subdivision Design Guide		Clarify how the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides will be used, ie what is their status in respect of the Plan objectives and rules?	No	
67	Subdivision Design Guide	The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.	Subdivision Design Guide: generally support, but note that as there are no rules for retention of trees or vegetation the associated guidelines for landscaping needs to be omitted or relaxed.	Yes	

76	Subdivision Design Guide	The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. Particular support is given to ... the Subdivision Design Guide (though for the latter noting that qualified skilled assessors will be an important part of the design review).	Approve Plan Change 58	Yes	
47	Subdivision Design Guide	G6.5: concerned about connotations of using the word use of the term "treatment" in this context. I.e. that hard surfaces and built environment are always deficient and in need of natural cover.	Suggest a more positive phrasing conveying a more complex understanding of the different components of design.	Unknown	
47	Subdivision Design Guide	G6.10: support this where practical	That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.	Unknown	
44	Subdivision Design Guide	Support	That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.	Unknown	
General Comments					
23	Rule 7.3.5	The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.	Residential Design Guide reference: a consequential change to remove the reference to the Multi-Unit Design Guide in rule 7.3.5 (Suburban Centre multi-unit development) needs to be updated to refer to the Residential Design Guide.	No	
22	Sunlight Access Plane Rules	The submitter also seeks that this plan change deals with concerns over the application of the Sunlight Access Plane rule, even though it is not presently subject to change in Plan Change 56. The submitter demonstrates a particular concern that the current sunlight access plane rules can allow for a situation of a 8metre high corner of a dwelling within 1m of the boundary (facilitated by a right of way adjoining the site). The submitter uses several diagrams to explain the effects that development under that rule can have on adjoining property owners and argues that this situation will become more common as more infill development (with associated right of ways) occurs.	The submitter would also like the Council to include a rule which addresses the sunlight access plane issue discussed by the submitter.	No	
84	Sunlight Access Plane Rules	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Sunlight Access Planes: seek change to these rules to take into account differing requirements from north to south.	Yes	
84	Sunlight Access Plane Rules	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Change the 1/3 height encroachment in include small area of corner of gable. Include mono pitched roofs.	Yes	
84	Site Coverage	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Allow for greater site coverage where a limited upper floor is included	Yes	

84	Site Coverage	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Site coverage is too restrictive as it does not take into account building bulk. Site coverage can be increased if permitted bulk is reduced.		
22	Sunlight Access Plane Rules	The submitter also seeks that this plan change deals with concerns over the application of the Sunlight Access Plane rule, even though it is not presently subject to change in Plan Change 56. The submitter demonstrates a particular concern that the current sunlight access plane rules can allow for a situation of a 8metre high corner of a dwelling within 1m of the boundary (facilitated by a right of way adjoining the site). The submitter uses several diagrams to explain the effects that development under that rule can have on adjoining property owners and argues that this situation will become more common as more infill development (with associated right of ways) occurs.	The submitter would also like the Council to include a rule which addresses the sunlight access plane issue discussed by the submitter.	No	
35	Ground Level	The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change but would like to see a further change in regard to ground levels, ie that new buildings should not be allowed to be higher through the excavation of the ground.	That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter and that building heights should be measured from the level of the finished excavation.	Yes	
84	Height	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Reduce maximum height of 8m + 1m (for pitch roof) to 7.5m except for 50% of dwelling footprint on steep sites.	Yes	
84	Height	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Allow two storey dwellings, but control the length of upper floor to any boundary (eg 8m max) and control placement of windows and heights.	Yes	
2	General	The submitter supports the Plan Change ... The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.	Provide an opportunity for an appeal process on any infill consents granted before any work actually commences.	No	
9	General	The submitter makes a number of comments in relation to the proposed plan change: 1. Retaining walls already in place at time of subdivision consent need thorough inspection to be sure they are capable of supporting future development. 2. Aerial photographs need to be kept up-to-date to ensure the Council has current information about a site (eg. existing vegetation).	That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
11	General	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.	Likewise, developers must not inconvenience neighbours during construction.	No	
11	General	The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.	Seeks that an independent ombudsman is appointed over Councils as residential ratepayers have no where to go to have their concerns heard.	No	
17	General	The submitter supports the general thrust of the policy in regards to infill housing.	That the Council notes the comments of the submitter in making its decision.	Unknown	

18	General	The submitter fully supports limiting the height of the second unit to single storey, introducing open space requirements for each dwelling, tightening subdivision controls and introducing requirements for visitor car parking.	Views and sunlight enjoyed by neighbours should be preserved and adequate separation between buildings and also from boundary fences to avoid shading and dampness.	Unknown	
19	General	The submitter supports improving the quality of urban design.	But seeks that the Council Urban Designers also provide input into the design of one or two unit developments in addition to the current three or more units on a site.	No	
20	General	The submitter welcomes the changes to the Council policy on infill, particularly the changes that strengthen the case for infill housing to be tempered. The submitter particularly supports limits to development opportunities and preventing change to the character of an area (this is not just style and architectural, but also social, community, amenity, wellbeing, security and safety). The submitter's major concern is that infill has been permitted that is too close to other houses, it has allowed housing density and building quality that will lead to substandard living conditions in the future. The density also affects roading infrastructure and parking space that was not designed for more intensive use.	That the Council adopt the new changes that will allow more room for consideration of the above factors when planning permission is given for infill housing.	No	
21	General	The submitter also adds a concern about the height of trees, which can become unsafe and block sun and views to other residents and requests there be a solution implemented for trees, as well and buildings.	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
25	General	The submitter supports the generalised intentions of the Plan Change. The submitter cites the example of a development in Agra Crescent, Khandallah as being totally out of character with nearby residential properties. The current standards need to be significantly tightened to preclude such massive and out of character future developments.	That approval should not be given for infill housing developments that exceed two storeys or for any more than three detached townhouses. An exemption to these rules could be considered based on it being suitable for the locality, be suitable for the local character and there should be a requirement for all adjoining property owners to give their written approval.	No	
26	General	The submitter does not oppose infill housing per se, but states that we need to keep in mind that Wellington's capacity to allow infill housing is finite unless we chose to reduce our quality of life.	That criteria be developed that assess individual applications as well as reserving streets and suburbs from such development that alters its character and reduces quality of life and environment for occupants. Suggestions for criteria include. 1. Sufficient space for each infill unit, which would also allow space for trees and other screening to create privacy. 2. The practice of walls being thrown up directly outside windows must not be allowed. Regards must be given to quality of life, light and views available to all. 3. Parking difficulties as more residents means more cars. 4. Building a 'granny flat' should be encouraged. 5. Areas and buildings with historical values and architecture need to be protected from such changes. 6. Views are not ours by right, "this needs to be amended to protect everyone and our living environment".	Unknown	

28	General	That new houses should be well insulated and not pose a safety risk to existing houses.	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
28	General	That people should have a choice of housing and lifestyle, however they believe that choice may be limited through infill housing. More data analysis of future society trends needs to be carried out.	That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.	No	
34	General	The submitter is encouraged by the plan change, even though as a developer of some infill housing, he realises it may make further development more difficult. The submitter queries the design assessment process.	Consider the adoption of a 'design police team', where proposed buildings go before a group of architects for sign-off or to make recommendations. Whilst not a perfect solution, it may produce better results than we are getting now.	Unknown	
36	General	The submitter also seeks some amendments to further neutralise the effect of development on stormwater, suggesting a number of methods that could be referred to in the Plan.	To make the suggested change to DP 56 and note our comments where appropriate regarding neutralising stormwater effects.	No	
40	General	The submitter is particularly concerned about infill housing proposals in heritage areas and areas where provisions for view shafts are assigned, citing an example of poor infill housing in Hawker Street.	That infill housing is opposed in heritage listed and view shaft listed areas.	Unknown	
40	General	The submitter cites a number of other suburbs in Wellington City where there is plenty of scope for infill housing.	That infill housing is supported in outer areas (eg. Kilbirnie, Miramar, Lyall Bay, Mount Cook, Strathmore and similar suburbs).	Unknown	
41	General	The submitter is particularly concerned about infill housing proposals in heritage areas and areas where provisions for view shafts are assigned, citing an example of poor infill housing in Hawker Street.	That infill housing is opposed in heritage listed and view shaft listed areas.	Unknown	
41	General	The submitter cites a number of other suburbs in Wellington City where there is plenty of scope for infill housing.	That infill housing is supported in outer areas (eg. Kilbirnie, Miramar, Lyall Bay, Mount Cook, Strathmore and similar suburbs).	Unknown	
44	General		That no further infill housing be allowed in Mt Victoria or any other of the older suburbs.	Unknown	
44	General		That greater attention be given to ensuring that this plan change be written in plan language eliminating unfamiliar words and phrases that could obscure the intentions of the rule.	Unknown	
45	General	The submitter has concerns about the quality of infill housing and seeks that only housing that blends with the area be allowed.	The submitter requests that 1. the Council not allow developers to degrade areas of Wellington with bulky housing unsuitable for the area and blocking neighbours views and sun. 2. that developers not use materials that rust and corrode only 6 months after completion. 3. encourage more environmentally designed or converted buildings and/or additions to buildings in the Wellington area.	No	
49	General	The submitter is pleased that the proposed changes dovetail with many of the concerns felt by the Committee over the seemingly uncontrolled development of infill housing.	Can the Council's planning include sunshine hours as well as sunlight access to housing units.	Unknown	

51	General	The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.	A third residential zone be introduced along main arterial routes suitable for multi-unit development.	No	
51	General	The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.	How will the Council administer the greatly increased workload that PC56 will generate?	No	
53	General	The submitter applauds plan change 56, but proposes one caveat – that council officers should have the discretion to consider multi-unit sheltered housing infill development in or near suburban centres. Sheltered housing refers to 30-45 purpose designed units grouped together for older residents.	Amend PC56 in favour of sheltered housing developments and make Wellington the model for New Zealand and give older folk more housing choice.	Unknown	
54	General	The submitter supports the Plan Change but seeks one amendment.	That a supervising drain layer be appointed to keep an eye on developments and also that access ways be fully investigated.	No	
61	General	The submitter raises concerns to do with privacy, building height, permeable surfaces and provisions for vehicles on the development.	That option 3 (outlined in the section 32 report) be adopted as it controls the issues listed above.	No	
70	General	The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.	Better assessment of cumulative effects onsite is appropriate.	Yes	
73	General	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change but does identify certain issues that need to be addressed.	Site amalgamation as a means of circumventing the intent of the changes needs to be addressed.	Yes	
73	General	The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change but does identify certain issues that need to be addressed.	Compact urban form is not sufficient to deliver on sustainability objectives and the overall approach needs to be more holistic.	Yes	
75	General	The submitter focuses on aspects of the plan change that need greater emphasis, including the environmental impacts of infill (eg. city green corridors, existing watersheds, amenity value of greenscape, quality and durability of buildings, the living quality of people).	That the Council consider strengthening the provisions that relate to assessment of cumulative effects for consents.	No	
75	General	The submitter focuses on aspects of the plan change that need greater emphasis, including the environmental impacts of infill (eg. city green corridors, existing watersheds, amenity value of greenscape, quality and durability of buildings, the living quality of people).	The rules should include reference to potential impacts from poorly sited infill on the city greenscape with particular regard to the adverse effects from building in shaded and persistently damp sites	No	
80	General	The submitter generally supports the plan change but consider the new provisions do not sufficiently explain the reasons for limiting impermeable site coverage. The submission outlines a variety of environmental effects that can result from increased hard surfacing of sites.	That the Council produce a booklet, which gives an understanding of the relationships between underlying geotechnics, vegetation and earthworks involved in infill housing to land stability and catchment run-off issues.	Yes	

81	General	The submitter generally supports the Plan change, but notes some additional comments.	The submitter seeks 1. More creative use of existing buildings. 2. Pedestrian friendly access and driveways. 3. Mixed uses. eg commercial and residential . 4. Historic character empathy.	Yes	
82	General	The submitter generally supports the proposed changes but notes some additional comments.	The submitter seeks: 1. More provision for mixed use 2. Better provisions for character areas 3. And better facilities for subdivisions.	Yes	
84	General	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Seek that a committee of urban designers, town planners and designers be formed to come up with a better outcome than the proposed changes.	Yes	
84	General	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Permitted Baseline: should be able to be used to promote the merits of a proposal. Agree it has been abused in the past but good clear rules should address this.	Yes	
84	General	The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.	Seek rules to define what privacy can be expected (suggestions offered).	Yes	