

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
John Tiley	142.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that the lack of inclusion of the ridgelines and hilltops in the schedules and the title of NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) demonstrates that ridgelines and hilltops are not protected to any significant degree.</p> <p>Considers that it is extraordinary that policies NFL-P3 to P7 set out how ONFL and SAL areas are subject to development, defying any reasonable expectation that such areas would be highly valued by the city and developments would be prohibited.</p>	Seeks that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops (and Marshalls Ridge) are listed in either SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes and/or SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.	Reject	No
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.188	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that there is no basis supplied for including the 18 identified ridgelines and hilltops as 'specialamenity landscapes' in SCHED11.	Disallow	Accept	No
Thomas Brent Layton	164.8	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	<p>Considers that the WCC should abandon the adoption of the Special Amenities Landscape as its application to all the "outer green belt" shows that its purpose is to constrain the urban development of the city.</p> <p>Considers that it is not about landscapes with special amenities as there is nothing special or unusual about the amenity the "outer green belt" provides. The landscape of flattish tops punctuated by streams in steep valleys is very common in the region; it is not special.</p> <p>Considers that the green belt idea stops the expansion of the city to areas where housing would be suitable and economic because of proximity to infrastructure. It tells those interested in capital gains from land holding within the urban boundary that they need not worry about much expansion in supply.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Remove the Special Amenities Landscape overlays from the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No
Thomas Brent Layton	164.9	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Opposes the application of the Special Amenities Landscape overlay to 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.	Remove the Special Amenities Landscape overlay from 183, 241, 249 and 287 South Karori Road.	Reject	No
Churton Park Community Association	189.30	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that the lack of inclusion of the ridgelines and hilltops in the schedules and the title of NFL-P2 (Use and development within ridgeline and hilltops) demonstrates that ridgelines and hilltops are not protected to any significant degree.</p> <p>Considers that it is extraordinary that policies NFL-P3 to P7 set out how ONFL and SAL areas are subject to development, defying any reasonable expectation that such areas would be highly valued by the city and developments would be prohibited.</p>	Seeks that the 18 ridgelines and hilltops (and Marshalls Ridge) are listed in either SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes and/or SCHED12 - High Coastal Natural Character Areas.	Reject	No
Meridian Energy Limited	FS101.189	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that there is no basis supplied for including the 18 identified ridgelines and hilltops as 'specialamenity landscapes' in SCHED11.	Disallow	Accept	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.95	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support in part	Considers that, in relation to objectives and policies in the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter, while the values for particular sites are outlined in Schedule 11, the characteristics are not. Clarification on the characteristics would assist with plan interpretation and application.	Clarify what characteristics of special amenity landscapes are in the PDP, and in particular the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter.	Accept	Yes
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.73	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	<p>Considers that development within the MDRZ area of the Submitters land can contribute to the existing urban form, providing land resources that can facilitate quality development.</p> <p>However, the proposed SAL overlay which the MRZ area that the land is subject to will restrict the potential medium density development of the land.</p> <p>Similar to the proposed SNA mapping of the land, the SAL overlay should not include the proposed MRZ area of the Submitters land.</p>	Amend Schedule 11 to remove special amenity landscape from submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Andy Foster	FS86.63	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.73]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.74	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Supports that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes.	Retain Mount Kaukau as an Special Amenity Landscape in Schedule 11 as notified	Accept	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.75	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Supports that Mount Kaukau and the Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape are Special Amenity Landscapes.	Retain Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape as an Special Amenity Landscape in Schedule 11 as notified	Accept	Yes
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.76	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose in part	Considers that there is a conflict between these provisions and the SAL overlay provisions which make residential development on this land restrictive and adds uncertainty. Notes that NFL-R11 requires buildings and structures within the SAL overlay to be no more than 8m in height. The MRZ height restriction is 11m. The proposed MRZ over the Submitters land is appropriate to support the strategic direction of the PDP.	Seeks that submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, be removed from Schedule 11.	Reject	No
Andy Foster	FS86.64	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.76]	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.77	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL schedule 11. Considers the inclusion MDRZ land within the SAL overlay, it restricts the land from being efficiently utilized for medium density residential development. Furthermore, the zoning layout has principal support from GWRC both in terms of policy direction (i.e. Policy 27) and the consented layout. The landscape identified to be 'distinctive and widely recognised by the community for the contribution to the amenity and quality of the environment' is predominantly located within the balance land which includes Crows Nest and the Skyline Walkway Trailhead.	Seeks that submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, be removed from Schedule 11.	Reject	No
Andy Foster	FS86.65	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.77]	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.78	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that the MDRZ area of the land should not be included in this SAL schedule 11. Considers that to fully realise the objectives and policies of the proposed zoning, the SAL overlay should be removed. This portion of the land has always been zoned for residential development, and this potential should be maintained as part of this planning process.	Seeks that submitter's land zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, be removed from Schedule 11.	Reject	No
Orienteering Wellington	FS32.2	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Submitter has restricted this submission to areas of relevance to Orienteering Wellington, and does not feel competent to reflect on some of the wider aspects of the plan and submission 290. It is their understanding that the submission includes a proposal to build medium density housing within the original submitters land interest, and retain a further block designated as an NOSZ. The area being proposed to be an NOSZ includes land that they have been provided access to for orienteering events by Kilmarston Developments. This area, which is adjacent to the Huntleigh Reserve has high value to our organisation in its natural state. It has potential to be a significant asset to the local community. Submitter notes the "Reasons" (section B, page 6 of the submission) text recognises the value of linkages in this area and a Willingness to enter dialogue over mechanisms to support both the NOSZ and residential uses of this land. They support this. Arrangements that allow for careful development, enhancement of linkages to other public land and tracks, and retention of the natural value of the reserve-adjacent land would benefit the community, and specifically ourselves as an orienteering club providing outdoor experiences to residents of the area. Submitter notes that the submission also includes a request to provide for installation of a water reservoir within the land identified as NOSZ. The specifics of the land designations that permit or hinder this are not within my competency. Considers that use of the proposed NOSZ area is unlikely to be unduly compromised by the presence of such a reservoir, and to note that with appropriate design, there may be access and linkage benefits from track infrastructure required for installation and maintenance of the reservoir. The reaching of agreement as described in "Reasons" section B (page 6 of submission) is far preferable to our organization that the alternative proposed in section C (bottom of page 6).	Allow	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andy Foster	FS86.66	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules /SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Considers that it is reasonable to uplift the Special Amenity Landscape over the residential part of the land. However Andy Foster suggests that the hearings panel find a way of ensuring that development is sympathetic to the landform and to the ecological values on the lower part of the land. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.78]	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.415	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support in part	Opposes the values as written. The identified values of SALs in the coastal environment are insufficient to give effect to the NZCPS. Furthermore, the "Relevant values under Policy 28 of the RPS" as identified in SCHED11 are uncertain and do not provide the level of information required to determine whether the effects of an activity can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Seek inclusion of the values of each SAL in SCHED11 to give effect to the RPS and NZCPS.	Amend SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes to include values of each SAL.	Accept	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.416	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support in part	Include Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape in SCHED11 as identified using criteria set out in Policy 27 of the RPS, and those areas of SAL identified in accordance with the adopted amendment by the Planning and Environment Committee on 23 June 2022.	Amend SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes to include new SAL Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape.	Accept	Yes
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.140	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Amend	Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.	Seeks that SAL schedule be amended to reflect historical and current built development over the Wellington Prison site (Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035).	Reject	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.36	Part 4 / Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Oppose	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land." Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."	Disallow	Accept	No
Penny Griffith	418.7	Schedules Subpart / Schedules / SCHED11 – Special Amenity Landscapes	Support	Supports the inclusion of the Outer Green Belt as a Special Amenity Landscape.	Retain SCHED11 - Special Amenity Landscapes as notified (With the Outer Green Belt locations included).	Accept	No