

**Before the Independent Hearings Panel
At Wellington City Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Hearing submissions and further submissions on the
Proposed Wellington City District Plan

**Statement of supplementary planning evidence of Adam
McCutcheon on behalf of Wellington City Council**

Date: 14 February 2023

INTRODUCTION:

1 My full name is Adam McCutcheon. I am employed as Acting Manager of the District Planning Team at Wellington City Council. My substantive role is that of a Team Leader in the District Planning Team.

2 I have read the respective evidence of:

Wellington's Character Charitable Trust ID 233 & FS82

- a) Wellington's Character Charitable Trust (Statement of supplementary evidence)
- b) Don Wignall for Wellington's Character Charitable Trust
- c) Tim Helm for Wellington's Character Charitable Trust

Kāinga Ora 391 & FS89

- d) Brendon Liggett for Kāinga Ora
- e) Matt Heale for Kāinga Ora
- f) Mike Cullen for Kāinga Ora
- g) Nick Rae for Kāinga Ora

Meridian Energy Limited ID 228 & FS101

- h) Christine Foster for Meridian Energy Limited

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga ID 70

- i) Dean Raymond for Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Tāonga

Transpower NZ Ltd ID 315 & FS29

- j) Dougall Campbell for Transpower NZ Ltd
- k) Pauline Whitney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd

Foodstuffs North Island ID 476 & FS23

l) Evita Key for Foodstuffs North Island

Wellington International Airport Ltd ID 406 & FS36

m) John Kyle for Wellington International Airport Ltd

Stride and Investore ID 470, FS107 & 405, FS108

n) Joe Jeffries for Stride and Investore

o) Mark Georgeson for Stride and Investore

Restaurant Brands Ltd submitter ID 349

p) Mark Arbuthnot for Restaurant Brands Ltd

KiwiRail ID 408 & FS72

q) Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock for KiwiRail

Firstgas Limited ID 304 & FS97.

r) Graeme John Roberts for Firstgas Limited

Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections ID 240.

s) Sean Grace for Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections

Wellington Heritage Professionals ID 233 & FS82

t) Eva Forster Garbutt and Chessa Stevens for Wellington Heritage Professionals

Ryman and Retirement Villages Association (RVA) ID 346 & 350

u) Phil Mitchell for Ryman and RVA

Waka Kotahi ID370 & FS103

v) Kesh Keshaboina for Waka Kotahi

w) Alastair Cribbens for Waka Kotahi

3 I have prepared this statement of evidence in response to expert evidence submitted by the people listed above to support the

submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Wellington City District Plan (the Plan / PDP).

- 4 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to the matters of [Hearing Stream 1 – Section 42A Report – Part One, plan wide matters and Strategic Direction](#).
- 5 This statement does not relate to matters of ‘walkable catchments’ or ‘rapid transit’ which were addressed in the s42A report. These responses are addressed by Mr Andrew Wharton in his Statement of Supplementary Planning Evidence.
- 6 Several statements were received late and compressed the time in which I have had to respond. Accordingly, I have focused my rebuttal on points of disagreement with the recommendations of my s42A report.

QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND CODE OF CONDUCT

- 7 [My section 42A report](#) sets out my qualifications and experience as an expert in planning.
- 8 I confirm that I am continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023, as applicable to this Independent Panel hearing.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 9 My statement of evidence:
 - a) Addresses the expert evidence of those listed above; and
 - b) Identifies errors and omissions from my s42A report that I wish to address.

RESPONSES TO EXPERT EVIDENCE

Kāinga Ora ID 391 & FS89

(Matt Heale for Kāinga Ora)

- 10 With respect to Mr Heale's commentary on the ISPP v Part One Schedule One process - I have addressed the factual and procedural process through which provisions were allocated in my [supplementary evidence in response to legal submissions on this matter](#). I have nothing more to add.
- 11 I confirm Mr Heale's observation at para 4.6 that the inclusion of design guides in the district plan (or not) and their substance will be addressed in later streams. This inconsistency occurred due to timing of the drafting of the [Overview s42A report](#).
- 12 I have not changed my mind with respect to the identification and inclusion of a Town Centre Zone in the plan (at a strategic level as it relates to this hearing).
- 13 I have outlined in my s42A report para 874 the reasons why a Town Centre Zone was not incorporated into the PDP. I add further detail below:
- a) The genesis of the growth approach in and around centres zones goes back to consultation on 'Growth Scenarios' and the Draft Spatial Plan. See the [Overview s42A report](#).
 - b) Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD does not compel the application of the High Density Residential Zone or six storey height limits within a walking catchment of any centre zone other than the City Centre and Metropolitan Centre Zones.

- c) Specific building height proposals in and around 'growth centres' (ie those subject to policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD) were informed by the 'Wellington Outer Suburbs Assessment and Evaluation'¹. The Berhampore and Newtown centres did not form part of this report and were modelled internally based on a similar methodology of amenities.
- d) This work identified that building heights of six storeys was generally appropriate within most centres greater than 'neighbourhood centres', ringed by areas of four storey medium density housing. See the [Hearing Stream 1 s42A report section 4.4](#) for more on this.
- e) The output of this was a consistent zoning pattern in these areas regardless of economic classification within the centres hierarchy and the national planning standards zone framework standard as 'Local Centre' or 'Town Centre'.
- f) Furthermore, the PDP (in contrast to many other second generation plans) does not have a strict categorisation of floor space limits for each centre. It is much more flexible, such that essentially a common set of rules across all centres zones has been adopted.
- g) I observe, as is noted by the submitter that there is varied implementation of the centres zones right across the region such that Porirua City does not have a City Centre zone, rather a Metropolitan Centre Zone.

¹ (see <https://wellington.govt.nz/-/media/your-council/plans-policies-and-bylaws/plans-and-policies/a-to-z/spatial-plan/introduction.pdf?la=en&hash=49F9857F3A4EAB78D835956244CDD36806FAB9A6> and <https://wellington.govt.nz/your-council/plans-policies-and-bylaws/district-plan/proposed-district-plan/whats-in-the-proposed-district-plan/supporting-documents>)

- h) With respect to Tawa centre – the centre zoned land, as well as a 10 minute walking catchment around it is subject to policy 3(c)(i) of the NPS-UD for rapid transit stops. Accordingly, its position within centres hierarchy has little bearing on built form standards in and around this area.
- i) Neither Mr Andrew Wharton nor I have recommended a specific walking catchment or High Density Residential Zone be applied around town centre zones in replacement to the amenity heatmapping.

14 Accordingly, I have not changed my mind with respect to the identification and inclusion of a Town Centre Zone in the plan. Should the Panel not agree with Mr Wharton’s recommendations with respect to walking catchments, it may wish to consider my advice differently.

15 I have not changed my mind with respect to CC-O2 in response to Mr Heale’s para 4.67 for the reasons in paras 834 – 837 of my s42A report.

16 I have not changed my mind with respect to UFD-O3 in response to Mr Heale’s paras 4.69 – 4.74.

17 I have outlined in para 13 (b) of this statement that nowhere does the NPS-UD require the application of the High Density Residential Zone or six storey height limits around any centre zone other than the City Centre and Metropolitan Centre Zones. The PDP applies a method of intensification focused on enablers of growth/amenity heatmapping which I consider is consistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.

18 I have not changed my mind with respect to UFD-O4 in response to Mr Heale’s para 4.75 – 4.78. My reading of the relevant section of the NPS-UD is such that the language ‘meet or exceed’ is

appropriate (copied below). UFD-O4 specifies the required competitiveness margin.

3.6 Housing bottom lines for tier 1 and 2 urban environments

- (1) The purpose of the housing bottom lines required by this clause is to clearly state the amount of development capacity that is sufficient to **meet expected** housing demand plus the appropriate competitiveness margin in the region and each constituent district of a tier 1 or tier 2 urban environment.

19 I have changed my mind with respect to UFD-O5 considering Mr Heale pointing out the wording of Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. Accordingly, I now support submission points 391.85 and 391.86 for Kāinga Ora.

20 A track changed version of the relevant recommendation and objective would be as follows -

HS1-Rec179: That UFD-O5 be amended as detailed below:

At least Ssufficient, feasible land development capacity is available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs of the City, as identified in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.

21 A section 32AA further evaluation is contained in Appendix 1 to this supplementary evidence.

22 I have not changed my view with respect to the deletion of the definition of 'Assisted Housing' and associated references throughout the plan and amendments to UFD-O6 considering Mr Heale's evidence in paras 4.84 – 4.86, 5.2 – 5.5. Please see paras 521 - 526 and 1182 of my s42A report.

23 The matter of the 'City Outcomes Contribution' mechanism and its relationship to Assisted Housing will be addressed in Hearing Stream 4. On the basis that this mechanism and its components

are still be considered I consider that it is appropriate to retain at this stage.

24 With respect to UFD-O8 I note that the substantive matter of Character Precincts and where they apply will be addressed in Stream 2.

25 While I do not consider it strictly necessary, I can accept Mr Heale's changes to UFD-O8 to recognise the contribution that character precincts can make towards accommodating growth while maintaining their values. This is grounded on the basis that all the objective and policies for the Medium Density Residential Zone still apply to the Character Precincts (including responding to growth).

26 Accordingly, a replacement track changed version of the relevant recommendation and objective would be as follows -

HS1-Rec182: That UFD-O8 be amended as detailed below:

Areas of identified special character are recognised and new development within those areas is responsive to their streetscape values while recognising their role in accommodating growth, context and, where possible, enhances that character.

27 A section 32AA further evaluation is contained in Appendix 1 to this supplementary evidence.

28 I have not changed my mind on the need for a definition of 'Multi-unit Housing' with respect to Mr Heale's 5.6 – 5.8. I do not fully understand why the submitter is opposed to this term that is commonly used across plans as a simpler method of referring to four or more residential units. It is not an uncommon term in the Wellington region.

29 I clarify Mr Heale's concerns that the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' now gives unlimited scope for upgrades is appropriate (para 5.13). Scope for the extent of upgrades is addressed through the relevant standards in the relevant rule. It is not typically unfettered.

30 The components relating to lawfully established operations and perceived effects are not in contention through submissions and commonly part of such a definition.

(Brendon Liggett for Kāinga Ora)

31 Many of the same comments I have made with respect to Mr Heale's statement on centres, assisted housing and the city outcomes contribution mechanism equally apply to Mr Liggett's.

32 In addition to Mr Liggett's statement at para 9.2 that definitions for different numbers of residential units increases risk – I disagree and consider this is inherent where a resource consent process is required to be followed and definitions are irrelevant.

(Mike Cullen for Kāinga Ora)

33 Many of the same comments I have made with respect to Mr Heale's statement on centres equally apply to Mr Cullen's evidence.

(Nick Rae for Kāinga Ora)

34 Many of the same comments I have made with respect to Mr Heale's statement on centres and character precincts equally apply to Mr Cullen's evidence.

Meridian Energy Limited ID228 & FS101

(Christine Foster for Meridian Energy Limited)

- 35 Ms Foster considers that SCA-O1 should be amended in the manner sought by Meridian Energy Limited [228.17]. This includes a specific reference to renewable energy generation and a transition away from dependence on fossil fuels.
- 36 I have not changed my view that the objective should be focussed on contributing meeting the city's zero carbon capital (net zero emissions) goal.
- 37 My wording better aligns with the Council's Te Atakura ambitions and is broader in scope than that sought by Meridian. While renewable energy can reduce dependence on fossil fuels (charging electric vehicles for example), infrastructure (more broadly) can contribute more to climate goals such as management of solid and other waste (whereby greenhouse gas emissions can be harnessed, and green infrastructure (which can have fewer carbon emissions needed to put in place).

Transpower NZ Ltd ID 315 & FS29

(Pauline Whitney for Transpower New Zealand Ltd)

- 38 I have addressed the factual and procedural process through which provisions were allocated in my [supplementary evidence in response to legal submissions on this matter](#).
- 39 I have agreed that the national grid can be identified as a qualifying matter under the criterion of 'nationally significant infrastructure' in the NPS-UD Subpart 6 - 3.32 and plan provisions included to limit building height and density accordingly (policy 4 of the NPS-UD). I have addressed the submissions of Transpower with respect to this matter in [section 4.1.2 of my S42A report for this hearing stream](#).

- 40 I am not surprised by the variation in the definition of 'qualifying matter' (or 'qualifying matter area') across the Wellington region identified by Ms Whitney in para 8.24.
- 41 I still consider that the approach recommended in **HS1-Rec111** to be the best one given that it covers the interests of Transpower as well as addressing other submitters and their experts eg, Wellington International Airport and KiwiRail (whose designations could be considered qualifying matters).
- 42 My recommendation enables the national grid to be a qualifying matter once the plan is settled. But again, in my view the importance of this is overstated. There is no concept of qualifying matters in the operative district plan, yet the operative district plan restricts development within the national grid buffer area. Once plan provisions are settled, they will have their intended effect restricting building height, density or 'sensitive activities' with reference to the National Grid Yard provisions.
- 43 I agree with Ms Whitney in para 8.5 that qualifying matters have ongoing relevance with respect to Policies MRZ-P4 and HRZ-P4.
- 44 I note though that these are 'generic' policies required by Schedule 3A of the RMA. These must be read in the context of a relevant district plan and the provisions within it to understand their relationship with the specific objectives policies and rules which have the effect of varying building height and density, or the application of the MDRS.
- 45 I acknowledge as identified by Ms Whitney that the amendment to SRCC-O1 sought by Transpower has not been addressed. My response is that the amendment to request 'associated infrastructure' is to be rejected given the focus of the objective is on the increased use of renewable energy generation sources at a

higher level. Given this focus I do not consider that a reference to associated infrastructure specifically to enable this is needed.

Wellington International Airport Ltd (WIAL) ID 406 & FS36

(John Kyle for Wellington International Airport Ltd)

46 With respect to Mr Kyle's commentary on the ISPP and Part One, Schedule One Process - I have addressed the factual and procedural process through which provisions were allocated in my [supplementary evidence in response to legal submissions on this matter](#).

47 I acknowledge that as identified in Mr Kyle's para 28 – 31, as well as para 76, the request by WIAL to include a statement outlining the effect of designations has not been addressed.

48 I note that there is already a paragraph about the effect of designations under the 'District Plan Framework' section of the chapter which I consider, for now, to be sufficient.

49 The Council and WIAL are currently undertaking work together to produce an additional spatial layer for the ePlan to demonstrate the relevance of WIAL's airspace designation for plan users. For much of the urban area of the city, building heights enabled by the plan and topographical considerations would not result in penetration of the obstacle limitation surface. Accordingly, the designation is of little practical relevance for many, despite the designation covering essentially the entire Wellington urban area. I suggest that once this work is completed in response to WCC 266.34, that this section of the plan be revisited.

50 For the reasons outlined in paragraph 41 of this evidence I do not recommend changing the definition of 'qualifying matter' in response to paras 37 – 39.

51 With respect to paras 45 – 51, I accept that separating out NE-O1 to reflect its constituent objectives in the relevant district wide chapters will enable the relevant s6 or s7 basis for management to be clarified. Strategic directions are difficult to draft in a way that does not parrot a lower order provision, or the Act itself. I note that the provisions intended to be addressed by this strategic direction chapter *do* arise from either s6 or s7 which is different from those in the HHSAM chapter, which are grounded in s6 only.

52 I do not see the need to have three separate objectives, and instead recommend that considering the expert evidence NE-O1 be amended as follows, in replacement of my recommendation at **HS1-Rec153**.

HS1-Rec153: That NE-O1 is amended as detailed below:

NE-O1

The natural character, outstanding landscapes and features, and ~~ecosystems~~ areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that contribute to the City's identity, including those that ~~and~~ have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, and protected. ~~, and, where possible, enhanced.~~

HS1-Rec185: That a new NE-O5 be added as detailed below:

NE-O5

The special amenity landscapes and ridgelines and hilltops that contribute to the City's identity, including those that have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are recognised and their values maintained or enhanced.

53 A section 32AA further evaluation is contained in Appendix 1 to this supplementary evidence.

54 In response to para 60 of Mr Kyle's evidence, I do not consider that the addition of 'as is practicable' is necessary to identify that incremental change can be made.

55 I consider that there is already scope within the plain meaning of 'contribute' to include taking incremental steps towards achieving the objective, such that significant change is not required all at once. Adding a qualifier of 'practicability' in my view adds another dimension and provides scope to argue that no contribution towards the objective is acceptable.

56 With respect to Mr Kyle's comments on SRCC-O2 (paras 61 – 70) which had a particular focus on sea walls, I do not consider that changes are necessary for the following reasons:

- a) The Strategic Objectives are not exhaustive and there are other infrastructure specific objectives that will address structures like sea walls and their functional and operational needs (eg SCA-O5);
- b) Seawalls are structures, not buildings. The Strategic Objective only addresses buildings. This means that mitigation structures are not captured;
- c) A consenting pathway is provided for sea walls, with very specific policy wording in the Coastal Environment chapter. This wording follows the NZCPS which also applies to hand engineering structures;
- d) Risk is a function of hazard *and* occupancy/use. The framework of the natural hazards chapter is such that high hazard does not necessarily equate to high risk. Some structures and buildings in a high hazard area can have a low or medium risk due to the nature of the building (for example decks, garages, toilet blocks in high hazard areas

are generally acceptable as their overall risk profile due to occupancy and use is low). The same applies to sea walls to a degree; and

- e) The objective should not be focused solely on habitable buildings as there will be some non-habitable buildings (such as hazardous materials stores) which in high hazard areas equate to a high-risk situation.

KiwiRail ID 408 & FS72

(Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock for KiwiRail)

57 I accept Ms Grinlinton-Hancock's advice in para 6.4 that the entire New Zealand rail network falls within the definition of 'nationally significant infrastructure' per the NPS-UD and accordingly it is *eligible* to be treated as a qualifying matter.

58 I have not however changed my view at this stage based on the evidence I have seen that it *should* be treated as a qualifying matter.

59 The merits of the related setbacks sought by KiwiRail will be addressed in Stream 2.

Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections ID 240

(Sean Grace for Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections)

60 I have not changed my view on the matter of the definition of 'supported residential care activity' after reading Mr Grace's evidence.

61 I agree that at its core, supported residential care activity is residential in nature in the same way that boarding houses are. My recommendation **HS1-Rec118** will help address this relationship.

- 62 The matter in question now is whether there should be a definition for such an activity, and its relationship to the higher order 'Residential Activity' definition. Its use or not is a matter being determined in the relevant zone based hearing stream. I note that some chapters do use the definition (eg Medium Density Residential Zone) while others do not (eg Centres Zones) and refer to the higher level 'residential activity' definition.
- 63 I understand why the Department seeks removal of the definition and reliance on the higher order residential activity definition, including that there can be local opposition to such activities (para 7.10). I suspect though that this is the case whether defined in a district plan or not.
- 64 Mr Grace notes that many of the effects of supported residential care activities are similar to that of large families with teenagers coming and going (para 7.8) and other effects (eg light, noise) are managed through other chapters of the plan. While this may be the case, the likelihood of consistent effects (including vehicle movements) to meet operational needs in my view means that including a definition in the plan (with ability to manage through standards when deemed necessary in relevant zones considering the level of anticipated amenity) is appropriate. This is also the case with 'boarding houses'.
- 65 With respect to the examples in para 7.7 (a) and (b), I confirm that the definition and associated rules would not be triggered. The definition is drafted such that all *residents* would need to be under the supervision, assistance, care and/or support by another person or agency.

Wellington Heritage Professionals ID 233 & FS82

(Eva Forster Garbutt and Chessa Stevens for Wellington Heritage Professionals)

66 I note that Ms Forster Garbutt and Ms Stevens are signatories to the submission made by the same group.

67 The following matters are not addressed in this stream, rather stream 3.

a) Definition of “Archaeological Site” (paras 19 – 28);

b) Definition “Maintenance and repair” (paras 29 – 34); and

c) Definition of “Reconstruction” and “Restoration” (paras 35 – 36).

68 I have not changed my view with respect to Strategic Objective CC-02, the introduction to the Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter and Strategic Objective SRCC-O3 for the reasons set out in paras 840, 903 and 1095 of my s42A report.

69 In addition, I note that the request of the relevant submission point identified in paragraph 52 of the statement is largely unqualified as to which buildings the environmental benefits of retaining existing buildings should be recognised. This is inconsistent with the direction of a plan, which seeks intensification and necessarily involves removal of at least some building stock.

Ryman and Retirement Villages Association ID 346 & 350

(Phil Mitchell for Ryman and RVA)

- 70 I consider that Mr Mitchell and I agree with each other that at their highest level, retirement villages are a 'residential activity'.
- 71 I consider that we also agree that given that they are not always *exclusively* residential activities and may also include a range of supporting, healthcare, and other facilities that a bespoke consenting pathway supported by a specific definition is justifiable given the associated effects also vary.
- 72 It reads that we also agree that their activity class need not be permitted in every zone, rather can be determined on a zone specific basis (para 37 EIC). It may be recommended in subsequent streams that they are Permitted (under the broader definition of residential activity) in the centres zones but addressed by a specific rule Restricted Discretionary rule in another zone (ie, the approach in the residential zones). I understand there is scope given RVA and Ryman's submissions on this matter.
- 73 To be clear, the specific policy framework and activity status for retirement villages will be determined in zone specific hearing streams, but in the context of nesting table definitions (which I have recommended be developed) I recommend that retirement villages should sit within that category as a specific form of residential activity.
- 74 I point to the relevant rule MRZ-R8 in the Medium Density Residential Zone which relies on policies MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) and MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as intention that the plan has been drafted to this effect.

75 My recommendation at **HS1-Rec117** to develop nesting tables will help plan users understand the eventual recommendation of the panel.

76 I have changed my view with respect to the definition of 'multi-unit development'. I now recommend that for clarity and to reflect my related recommendations for 'health care facilities' and 'supported residential care activity' that retirement villages be excluded from this definition too.

77 Accordingly, I now recommend the definition of 'multi-unit development' be amended as follows, in replacement of my recommendation at **HS1-Rec75**:

HS1-Rec75: That the definition of multi-unit housing is amended as detailed below:

means any development that will result in four or more residential units on a site, excluding retirement villages and residential development within the Oriental Bay Precinct Area.

78 A section 32AA further evaluation is contained in Appendix 1 to this supplementary evidence.

79 I have not changed my view with respect to SCA-O2. As I have noted in para 1010, the intent of the objective is to recognise the benefits of intensification and the efficient use of land on the provision and utilisation of infrastructure.

80 I disagree that retirement villages fully internalise their effects on the public system. The public system will ultimately deliver drinking water and receive storm and wastewater for disposal (following any internalised detention or treatment).

81 I do not consider that any further amendments (or deletion of) SCA-O3 is necessary. The objective is focused on development of a nature or scale that contributes to a well-functioning urban environment or is significant at a regional or national level.

82 If retirement villages often provide for public open space, community and social infrastructure as identified by Mr Mitchell at para 50, then the objective should not be cause for concern.

83 I have not changed my view re SRCC-O4 at para 55.

84 I do not agree that the reference to medium density in UFD-O3 is unnecessary per para 60 of Mr Mitchell's evidence for the reasons in para 1173 of my s42A report.

No responses to the following evidence

85 I have no responses in relation to the following expert evidence statements as they relate to walkable catchments', 'rapid transit' or supported the relevant recommendations of my s42A report:

<p>Transpower NZ Ltd</p> <p>ID 315 & FS29</p>	<p>Dougall Campbell for Transpower NZ Ltd</p>
<p>Wellington's Character Charitable Trust</p> <p>ID 233 & FS82</p>	<p>Wellington's Character Charitable Trust (Statement of supplementary evidence)</p> <p>Don Wignall for Wellington's Character Charitable Trust</p> <p>Tim Helm for Wellington's Character Charitable Trust</p>
<p>Stride and Investore</p> <p>ID 470, FS107 & 405, FS108</p>	<p>Joe Jeffries for Stride and Investore - submitter</p> <p>Mark Georgeson for Stride and Investore</p>

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga ID 70	Dean Raymond for Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Foodstuffs North Island ID 476 & FS23	Evita Key for Foodstuffs North Island
Restaurant Brands Ltd ID 349	Mark Arbuthnot for Restaurant Brands Ltd
Firstgas Limited ID 304 & FS9	Graeme John Roberts for Firstgas Limited
Waka Kotahi ID370 & FS103	Kesh Keshaboina for Waka Kotahi Alastair Cribbens for Waka Kotahi

Additional matters

86 Since publication of the s42A report I been made aware of the following errors, omissions and late submissions which I wish to address now.

Z energy (submission point 361.6)

87 The following submission point was missed from the S42A report which sought amendments to the definition of 'commercial activity'.

88 I would have rejected the submission point because the definition is a national planning standards definition and cannot be amended.

Board of Airline Representatives New Zealand (BARNZ)

89 A late further submission from BARNZ was accepted per Minute 3.

- 90 It has been allocated number FS139.2.
- 91 Further submissions were made in support of Wellington International Airport Limited (406) on a number of provisions across the plan including those addressed in Hearing Stream 1. Please see <https://wellington.govt.nz/-/media/your-council/plans-policies-and-bylaws/district-plan/proposed-district-plan/files/further-submissions-by-response.pdf?la=en&hash=82B691249EEDF964392FFFA88A9518298D752B35>.

Date:

14 February 2023

Adam McCutcheon

**Acting Manager, District
Planning**

Wellington City Council

Appendix 1: Section 32AA further evaluation report

HS1-Rec179: That UFD-O5 be amended as detailed below:

At least Sufficient, feasible land development capacity is available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs of the City, as identified in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.

In my opinion, the recommended amendments to 'UFD – O5' are more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the plan than the notified provisions.

I consider that it will:

- a) Increase consistency with the NPS-UD 2020.

Consequently, the amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the plan.

The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, cultural or economic effects than the notified provisions.

HS1-Rec182: That UFD-O8 be amended as detailed below:

Areas of identified special character are recognised and new development within those areas is responsive to their streetscape values while recognising their role in accommodating growth. context and, where possible, enhances that character.

In my opinion, the recommended amendments to 'UFD – O8' are more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the plan than the notified provisions.

I consider that it will:

- a) Increase alignment across Part 2 and Part 3 of the Plan;

Consequently, the amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the plan.

The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, cultural or economic effects than the notified provisions.

HS1-Rec153: That NE-O1 is amended as detailed below:

NE-O1

The natural character, outstanding landscapes and features, and ecosystems areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that contribute to the City's identity, including those that ~~and~~ have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, and protected, ~~and, where possible, enhanced.~~

HS1-Rec185: That a new NE-O5 be added as detailed below:

NE-O5

The special amenity landscapes and ridgelines and hilltops that contribute to the City's identity, including those that have significance for manawhenua as kaitiaki are recognised and their values maintained or enhanced.

In my opinion, the recommended amendments to 'NE-O1' and the addition of 'NE-O5' are more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the plan than the notified provisions.

I consider that it will:

- a) Increase alignment across Part 2 and Part 3 of the Plan;

Consequently, the amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the plan.

The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, cultural or economic effects than the notified provisions.

HS1-Rec75: That the definition of multi-unit housing is amended as detailed below:

means any development that will result in four or more residential units on a site, excluding retirement villages and residential development within the Oriental Bay Precinct Area.

In my opinion, the recommended amendments to 'NE-O1' and the addition of 'NE-O5' are more appropriate in achieving the objectives of the plan than the notified provisions.

I consider that it will:

- a) Increase clarity of relationship between definitions in the plan.

Consequently, the amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the plan.

The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, cultural or economic effects than the notified provisions.