

**Wellington City Proposed District Plan
Report 4A
Overview and General**

**Appendix 1
Recommended Responses to
Submissions and Further Submissions**

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Julie Patricia Ward	103.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the height limit for all centres defined as LCZ's or NCZ's, other than heritage sites, should be consistent at 18 metres. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the height limit for all areas zoned as LCZ (Local Centre Zone) or NCZ (Neighbourhood Centre Zone) is set at a consistent 18m, excluding heritage sites.	Reject in part – while some LCZ and NCZ have revised 18m heights, others vary depending on the centre.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Supports the allowance for taller buildings around centres as this promotes growth and thriving, vibrant centres. Vibrant centres and public spaces are important to the growing student population and families.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the encouragement of residential development in centres and new, improved building standards that reflect health and safety standards, are cheaper in the long run, and ensure that the centres and businesses are more prepared for climate change and natural disasters.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports that ground-floor level buildings in centres are used for non-residential activities. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that ground-floor level buildings in centres are used for non-residential activities.	Accept, reflected in the Centres provisions.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the continuation of providing for mixed-use areas that enable commercial, light industrial, recreational, and community activities to occur. This is profitable for centres and businesses, and makes students more comfortable about using mixed-use areas for their own purposes which has good flow-on effects.	Seeks that mixed-use areas continue to be provided for in Centres and Mixed Use Zones.	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Anne Lian	132.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Ingo Schommer	133.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Olivier Reuland	134.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Braydon White	146.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments around Centres Zones. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Amos Mann	172.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Supports a circular economy, space for innovation, education and behaviour change, and a low carbon future.	Seeks that multifunctional community spaces are created within centres as Climate Action Hubs.	Reject.	No.
Amos Mann	172.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Patrick Wilkes	173.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Pete Gent	179.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Peter Nunns	196.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that it is unclear whether multi-storey developments come with conditions that developers also create commercial opportunities for small, independent businesses to develop, or if they are only for residential purposes.	Clarify the conditions for developers of multi-storey buildings with regard to providing commercial opportunities.	Reject, further clarification not considered necessary	No.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
McDonald's	274.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Considers that while high quality building design is important, the active frontage controls in the PDP are overly prescriptive as currently worded.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
McDonald's	274.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	Considers that while high quality building design is important, the consenting requirements for additions and alterations in the PDP are overly prescriptive as currently worded.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Steve Dunn	288.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that to meet the objectives of a healthy living environment, the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.	Seeks that the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers the need for a Design Review Panels for all mixed use developments and centres where developments are over 3 levels. The wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time. A solution would be a mandatory Design Panel Review, as it would encourage high quality design outcomes in the city. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a mandatory Design Panel Review be adopted for all mixed use developments and centres where developments are over 3 levels.	Reject in part – Urban Design Panels to be included in the CCZ, MCZ, LCZ and NCZ as a method.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.223	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.223	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.268	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support in part	Considers the approach taken across these zones gives effect to operative RPS policy 30	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.	Accept.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.269	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers for the provisions across these zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Seeks to ensure the Commercial and Mixed-use Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.	Accept.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	The “centres hierarchy” approach adopted by the higher order provisions of the PDP is supported, insofar as it recognises that centres can and should be the primary focal point for business activity in the District, noting the importance of supermarkets in helping to achieve prosperous centres.	Supports the Centres hierarchy, subject to amendments following the application of the proposed “centres plus” approach.	Accept.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	The increase in intensity of the existing CMUZ land under the PDP is supported, as it is understood that the difference between the Centre Zones primarily relates to the height that is enabled in these zones.	Retain the Centre Zones as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part, Centre Zones are retained with some changes as detailed in the Panel’s reports.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	It is considered that the consent requirement across the CMUZ for supermarkets is not in accordance with the higher order strategic direction outlined in Objectives CEKP-O2 and CEKP-O3 where business needs are envisaged to be enabled within the CMUZ. As currently proposed, supermarkets are not permitted in any CMUZ by virtue of needing a consent for the building proper (as in, while the activity itself is permitted in all Centre zones irrespective of size, and in the Mixed-Use zone up to 1500m2 GFA, all buildings greater than 100m2 in all Centre zones and greater than 500m2 in the Mixed-Use zone need resource consent). This is at odds with the widely accepted role that supermarkets play in centres. Supermarkets act as anchor tenants, and as catalysts for investment in centres of all scales. The importance of convenient and efficient access to supermarkets as critical infrastructure or an essential service has also been recognised in other districts, most recently highlighted by the Covid-19 pandemic. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones have requirements for supermarkets that are in accordance with the higher order strategic direction outlined in Objectives CEKP-O2 and CEKP-O3 where business needs are envisaged to be enabled within these zones.	Reject.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.501	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the Centre hierarchy should be reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board. Centre Zoning standards should be expanded to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce a new chapter.	Seeks that the Centres hierarchy is reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.	Accept in part, all provisions have been reviewed through the submission and hearing process.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.36	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.502	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that commercial intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use zones should be reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board. Centre Zoning standards should be expanded to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce a new chapter.	Seeks that commercial intensification provisions in the Commercial (Centres) and Mixed-Use Zones are reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.	Accept in part, all provisions have been reviewed through the submission and hearing process.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.503	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that new Town Centre chapter provisions should be added to the plan. [Refer to original submission, including Appendix 2]	Seeks that a Town Centre chapter is added to the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones classification.	Reject - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.505	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support in part	Active frontage controls are generally supported, but it is considered that they should only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets.	Retain active frontage control provisions with amendments.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.506	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support in part	The need for restrictions on the gross floor area of retail is supported, particularly within commercial (Centres) and mixed-use zones as this will ensure that there are appropriate opportunities for residential activities in these areas. However, is noted that the Integrated Retail Activity gross floor areas of 20,000m ² do not reflect the scale of the Centres hierarchy anticipated in the NPSUD and the National Planning Standards.	Retain gross floor area restrictions with amendment for Local Centre Zones and Neighbourhood Centre Zones.	Accept in part – revised GFA restrictions for NCZ.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
David Cadman	398.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – the Centres zones provide for this development	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the provision of a range of commercial and mixed-use environments.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the hierarchy of centres.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
VicLabour	414.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Oppose in part	Considers the 20m building depth standard in certain neighbourhood centres is too restrictive [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the 20m maximum building depth standard for certain neighbourhood centres be increased.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.	Reject - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Newtown Residents' Association	F563.2	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that the proposal to add Town Centres - ie Newtown, Miramar and Tawa - to the Centres hierarchy is an unnecessary change. As outlined in the submission appendix of Kāinga Ora's original submission, the primary purpose seems to be to justify increasing the walking catchments and increasing permitting building heights up to 8 storeys. Newtown Residents' Association original submission (#440) outlines that there is enough realisable capacity for development even if the PDP is modified to further reduce walking catchments and increase character precincts. The rationale for the Kāinga Ora submission is that maximising development is desirable and leads to a "well functioning urban environment". We argue that zoning for vastly more development than will be realised in the foreseeable future is counter productive and has many negative effects on the urban environment. [Inferred reference to submission 391.2]	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	F568.3	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Submitter opposes new Town Centre Zone to be added to Newtown including corresponding objectives.	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Hilary Watson	F574.26	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchments in PDP are already too large - reducing them can still provide predicted development capacity. They should be reduced to avoid negative effects on the community.	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	F580.9	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.62	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington.	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.17	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that SNAs are applied to all zones where relevant criteria are met.	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.	Reject - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Newtown Residents' Association	F563.3	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Newtown Residents' Association submit that the walkable catchments in the PDP are certainly adequate to allow more than enough realisable development capacity, and could be reduced further. Zoning for more development than needed has unintended negative consequences. [Inferred reference to submission 391.3]	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	F580.10	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.63	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington.	Disallow	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.18	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, considers that it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the district plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.75	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.75	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that it is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This is because the design guides do not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and the submitter considers it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks that all direct references to the design guides be deleted and replaced with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought, for example "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide". [Inferred decision sought].	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.76	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.76	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that there should be mandatory design requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add mandatory design requirements. [inferred decision requested].	Reject in part.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.66	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks the relevant provisions (which refer to design guides as notified) instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Reject in part.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should provide a "centre plus" approach by adopting a more flexible planning regime, rather than the current PDP's direct and control model of setting commercial and land supply use. To support this "centres plus" approach, the activity status of supermarkets (essential services and catalysts for well-functioning urban environments) would be more appropriate as: - Permitted in all Centre zones, - Restricted Discretionary in the Mixed-Use Zone, for larger-scale supermarkets;- Discretionary in the General Industrial Zone and General Residential Zone. Currently, the PDP does not enable supermarkets in any zone without resource consent (be it for the activity itself or for the building which would be required to accommodate a supermarket in terms of GFA). This is at odds with both the higher order enabling framework set out in the PDP and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 ("NPSUD"). It is considered that a restricted discretionary activity consent process is sufficient to undertake the assessment required to address the effects of infringements in respect of built form and site layout, without needing a broader fully discretionary approach. This again supports a more efficient consenting process to focus assessment where needed without detracting from an enabling planning framework for appropriate activities in appropriate locations. This approach is elaborated upon in additional submission points. The "centres plus" approach recognises the primacy of centres but also that business activity ought to be enabled in other zones, where appropriate. In particular, this approach recognises that functional need and catchment drivers may dictate the location of supermarket operations, on the fringe, or in some cases, outside of identified centres.	Seeks that a "centres plus" approach is adopted in the Proposed District Plan, so as to provide more flexibility in the planning of supermarkets in Centre Zones, Mixed-Use Zones, General Industrial Zones and General Residential Zones.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.2	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	FSNI support supermarkets being permitted activities in Centre Zones. Submission point 359.1 supports submission points 476.92, 476.94, 476.100.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.5	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RETAIL ACTIVITY	Support	Supports the definition of "Retail activity".	Retain the definition of "Retail activity" as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPERMARKET	Support	Supports the definition of "Supermarket".	Retain the definition of "Supermarket" as notified.	Accept.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	476.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / LARGE FORMAT RETAIL	Support	Supports the definition of "Large format retail".	Retain the definition of "Large format retail" as notified.	Accept.	No.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that active street frontages should be part of the district plan. Active frontages area a better use of ground floors and street front boundaries, as they allow for small business on the street to provide opportunities for community connection.	Supports active frontages in the district plan.	Accept.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	<p>Considers that where activities infringe identified standards, a restricted discretionary activity status remains appropriate, rather than defaulting to a more onerous discretionary activity status, where discretion is unfettered in assessment. Restricted discretionary activity status can be accompanied by suitably limited criteria that still ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined.</p> <p>It is noted that the PDP has generally taken this approach when it comes to standard infringements with the exception of infringing MCZ-R15, NCZ-R13, and LCZ-R13 whereby discretionary activity consent is required if the provision of visible carparks along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage is proposed. Woolworths considers a restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate, and specifically with consideration given to operational and functional needs of larger commercial activities like supermarkets. Supermarkets often require car parking to be visible, both from commercial viability perspective but also given the requirements to separate loading and servicing activities from public interfaces. This site layout requires that loading is located to the rear of a store, with the building in front and the entrance accessible and legible from the car park and street frontage. Car parking to the rear removes the ability to keep loading and servicing separate from public areas and leads to safety and CPTED issues after hours. These are examples of operational and functional requirements for supermarkets that are overlooked by application of blanket urban design ideals in these standards.</p>	<p>Seeks that restricted discretionary activity status are retained when activities infringe identified status.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Accept.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Opposes to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development.</p> <p>Considers it inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.15	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that adding extra building height in the Inner City for social contribution should not be allowed under any circumstances.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	<p>Opposes NCZ-P10, LCZ-P10, MCZ-P10, and CZ-P11 and related rules.</p> <p>While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Remove all references in the PDP and Design Guides to City Outcomes Contributions.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that zoning in the PDP should be amended according to the mapping proposed in Appendix 4.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 4]</p>	<p>Seeks that zoning in the Proposed District Plan be amended according to the mapping proposed in Appendix 4.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission, Appendix 4]</p>	Reject in part.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.20	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept in part.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.27	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.	Reject - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept in part - no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.28	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. 7. Any consequential updates to maps.	Reject – no new Town Centre Zone to be added to the District Plan.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Concerned that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is not given consideration and referred to in any relevant rules for the Commercial and Mixed Use zones	Amend appropriate parts of the Commercial and Mixed use zone rules to reflect that they will give effect to the Commercial and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part – rules have been amended with respect to implementation of the design guides.	Yes.
Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments in Centres zones. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - the Centres provisions enable this development.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Submitter considers that there needs to be clearer decision-making processes. Submitter is concerned that the decision-making process for restricted discretionary activities could be convoluted and unnecessarily delay development. This will particularly be the case if the Design Guides are retained as they overlap with the PDP in various areas. We have suggested a 'Design Excellence Panel' be constituted for each significant development and be solely responsible for assessing design outcomes of projects. This has the potential to speed up the process, ensure appropriately qualified people are in the room together to assess applications "in the round" and achieve positive design outcomes for Wellington City. We would welcome exploring other suggestions on how to make the planning process more efficient.	Seeks that a 'Design Excellence Panel' be constituted for each significant development and be solely responsible for assessing design outcomes of projects.	Accept in part, new urban design panel method introduced to centres zones.	Yes.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons: - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory.- The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).	Seeks that references to the Design Guide in the Proposed District Plan be removed and that the Design Guides should be non-statutory in a similar way to the Auckland Design Manual. They should be used for guidance on how the objectives and policies in Part 3 may be implemented.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.252	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with the RVA's primary submission.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.252	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject – the Design Guides are to remain as a statutory part of the District Plan	No.
Airbnb	126.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for visitor accommodation in the Centres zones.	Retain provisions providing for visitor accommodation as an Permitted Activity in the Centres Areas as notified. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept.	No.
McDonald's	274.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Not specified	In general, the submitter (McDonald's) acknowledges the need for high quality building design.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Kirsty Woods	437.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that intensification should occur in the suburban centre, combined with new developments in underutilised sites (for example Adelaide Road) would provide for predicted housing requirements.	Seeks that intensification is enabled around Centres and underutilised sites. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part - the Centres provisions enable this development.	No.
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - the Centres provisions enable this development.	No.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones / General point on Commercial and mixed use Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that the plan enables larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - the Centres provisions enable this development.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.269	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / General MCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</p> <p>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</p> <p>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</p> <p>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p><u>Changing communities</u></p> <p>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p>	Accept in part – new retirement villages policy added to the MCZ	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.280	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-R20	Amend	Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MCZ-R20. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the requirements of MCZ-S1 - MCZ-S10. However, considers that standard should not be applicable to retirement villages. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes clause 3 matter of discretion relating to City Outcomes Contributions. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides, their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects offered by retirement villages; the functional	<p>Retain MCZ-R20.2 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amend as follows:</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MCZ-R1920.1 cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The matters in MCZ-P6, MCZ-P7, MCZ-P8 and MCZ-P9 (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages);</p> <p>2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with MCZ-S1, MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, MCZ-S6, MCZ-S7, MCZ-S8, MCZ-S9, MCZ-S10 and MCZ-S11;</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height limit requirement at Ngāio, Berhampore and Aro</p>	Reject.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
				and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under MCZ-R20 should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages under MCZ-R20 that complies with MCZ-S1 and MCZ-S4 should be precluded from being limited notified.	Valley centres and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); 4. The Residential Design Guide (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure; 8. For retirement villages: i. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; ii. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length; iii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; iv. When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(8)(i) – (iii), consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. v. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Property Council New Zealand	338.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.207	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.207	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.161	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Oppose The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of "thresholds" for certain types of development result in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: ... 2. incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3-2. Incorporating 4-3. Incorporating 5-4. Enabling	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.53	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Submission point 349.161 seeks to amend MCZ-P10. FSNI submission point 476.43 seeks to delete this policy in its entirety, FSNI submission seeks that functional or operational requirements of activities and development are recognised in MCZ-P7 in submission point 476.42.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Accept in part.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.279	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of MCZ-P10 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety as notified.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Woolworths New Zealand	359.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that MCZ-P10 is unclear and should be amended. The policy contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments (under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development) and for over height development comprising 25 or more units or any comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre zone (MCZ), Neighbourhood Centre zone (NCZ), Local Centre zone (LCZ) and High Density Residential zone (HRZ). As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the LCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	Amend MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development that are over height in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G97 G107, including through either: ...	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Submission point 359.76 seeks to amend MCZ-P10. FSNI submission point 476.43 seeks to delete MCZ-P10 in it's entirety.	Disallow / Disallow this submission in part.	Accept in part.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support in part	MCZ-P10 is supported, as it seeks to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107.	Retain MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) with amendment.	Reject in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	MCZ-P10 should also recognise the existing environment and the functional requirements of a range of activities.	Amend MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, <u>while recognising the existing environment</u> including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility. 6. Recognises that alternative design responses are necessary for functional requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.665	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support in part	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in MCZ-P10 for development for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. 	Retain MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment.	Reject in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.160	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.160	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.666	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in MCZ-P10 for development for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. 	Amend MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive <u>Encourage</u> development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to <u>contribute to positive outcomes</u> deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107 G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. <u>Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or</u> 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Investore Property Limited	405.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks deletion of MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.107	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-P10. Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Delete MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it's entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
VicLabour	414.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Amend	The submitter has requested removing the height limit in the CCZ, in which case the City Outcomes Contribution would not be relevant. The submitter considers that if that occurs, Council should consider whether it is still worth retaining the City Outcomes Contribution in other zones – it may be preferable removing the concept altogether.	Seeks that MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) be amended in accordance with any changes to CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution). Should height limits in the CCZ (City Centre Zone) be removed seeks that Council considers whether it is still worth retaining the City Outcomes Contribution in other zones (including MCZ (Metropolitan Centre Zone)).	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.91	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Support	Submission point 416.125 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.43 but FSNI submission point 476.43 seeks to delete MCZ-P10 in it's entirety.	Allow / Allow submission in part.	Accept in part	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Delete MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it's entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes due to the points raised in relation to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' [refer to original submission]	Delete MCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Foodstuffs North Island	476.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Metropolitan Centre Zone / MCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes MCZ-P10. While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to noncompliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.	Delete MCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.104	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / DEV1-R1	Amend	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules.</p> <p>Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	<p>Amend DEV1-R1.1.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 25 or more residential units or is a non-residential building;</p> <p>....</p>	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.259	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / General MUZ	Amend	<p>Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Mixed Use Zone is required.</p>	<p>Add the following new policies in the Mixed Use Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p>1. <u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p>a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u></p> <p><u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Reject – new policy for retirement villages not supported in the MUZ	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.260	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	<p>Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Mixed Use Zone is required.</p>	<p>Add the following new policies in the Mixed Use Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p>1. <u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p>a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u></p> <p><u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Reject – new policy for retirement villages not supported in the MUZ	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.261	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Mixed Use Zone / New MUZ	Amend	<p>As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ-R10). Considers that the Local Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under MUZ-R16). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' in the Mixed Use Zone chapter rule as follows:</p> <p><u>MUZ-RX Retirement villages</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>	Accept in part – new Discretionary rule for retirement villages added to the MUZ	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.256	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Commercial	Amend	<p>Supports the construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures being a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under COMZ-R9. Does not oppose the inclusion of the</p>	<p>Retain COMZ-R9 (Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures) and seeks amendment as follows:</p>	Reject.	No.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McDonald's	274.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that NCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes
Property Council New Zealand	338.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution replaced with revised 'City Development Outcomes' policy	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.205	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.205	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Oppose The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of "thresholds" for certain types of development result in a "pass/fail" assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: ... Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: ... 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3.2. Incorporating... 4.3. Incorporating... 5.4. Enabling...	Reject as the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	No
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	FSNI submission seeks to delete this policy in its entirety (476.15), FSNI submission 476.16 seeks that functional or operational requirements of activities and development are recognised in NCZ-P7. Submission point 349.70 just seeks to amend NCZ-P10.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.218	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of NCZ-P10 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes
Woolworths New Zealand	359.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Amend	Considers that NCZ-P10 is unclear and should be amended. Notes that the policy contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments (under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development) and for over height development comprising 25 or more units or any comprehensive development in the MCZ, NCZ, LCZ and HRZ. As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the NCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	Amend NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height , large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development that are over height in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107 G97, including through either: ...	Reject as the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.3	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	FSNI seeks to remove NCZ-P10 in its entirety in submission point 476.15. Submission point 359.51 seeks to amend NCZ-P10 so opposes 476.15.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.434	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Support	NCZ-P10 is supported as the need for ensuring access to outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas is supported.	Retain NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.	Reject as the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.529	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose in part	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in NCZ-P10 for the following reasons: (a) It is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; (b) Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and (c) All of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. Seeks amendments to instead encourage positive outcomes of development.	Opposes in part NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.152	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission where The RVA sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by The RVA.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.152	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission where Ryman sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by Ryman.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.530	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' in NCZ-P10 for the following reasons: (a) It is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; (b) Over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and (c) All of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. Seeks amendments to instead encourage positive outcomes of development.	Amend NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive Encourage development in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5.4. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Reject as the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.153	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	The RVA oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission where The RVA sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by The RVA.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.153	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Not specified	Ryman oppose in part the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission where Ryman sought this provision be deleted in full.	Amend / Disallow the submission point and instead grant the relief sought by Ryman.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Investore Property Limited	405.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks deletion of NCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
VictLabour	414.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Delete NCZ-P10 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it's entirety.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	476.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / NCZ-P10	Oppose	<p>Opposes NCZ-P10.</p> <p>While FSNi recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to noncompliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Delete NCZ-P10 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.	Accept – the COC / new City Development Outcomes policy will not apply in the NCZ	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.206	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Support	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities. Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.207	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u> <u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities. Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Accept in part – mew policy specific to retirement villages added.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.208	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Support	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ-R10). Considers that the Neighbourhood Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' rule as follows:</p> <p><u>NCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>	Accept in part – new rule added with Discretionary activity status.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.209	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Amend	As currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ-R10). Considers that the Neighbourhood Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R18). Permitted activity status recognises retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit by way of enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	<p>Add new 'Retirement villages' rule to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone as follows:</p> <p><u>NCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></p>	Accept in part – new rule added with Discretionary activity status.	Yes.

Appendix 1 - Overview report

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.35	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / New NCZ	Oppose	Oppose residential activities on the ground floor to support vibrant streets.	Disallow	Accept in part – new rule does not allow retirement villages as a permitted activity	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.204	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Support	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> 1. <u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> 2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.205	Commercial and mixed use Zones / Neighbourhood Centre Zone / General NCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> 1. <u>Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> 2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities. Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes