

Wellington City Proposed District Plan

ISPP wrap up and integration hearing

Part 2: Design Guides - Centres and Mixed Use

Appendix B - Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Paul Burnaby	44.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports City Outcomes Contribution (pages 29 to 31).	Retain Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as notified.	Reject. The CMUDG is recommended to be amended.	No.
Nick Ruane	61.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Opposes G91 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment.	Accept. G91 is recommended to be replaced.	Yes.
Nick Ruane	61.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G91 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended as follows: For developments that are likely to be occupied by people with limited mobility, where possible, provide ground level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to New Zealand Standards for access and mobility. Consider things such as....	Accept in part. G91 is recommended to be replaced with a new guidance point.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.185	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.185	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.66	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Reject. This matter is addressed by rules in the centres zones.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that G97 (City Outcomes Contribution) is removed from the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the extent of scope to increase height and public/ neighbour involvement in that, and remove possibility for height to extend above the permitted envelope to be delivered using the City Outcomes Contribution mechanism in the residential zones is reconsidered.	Accept in part. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution mechanism is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the workability and effectiveness of the City Outcomes Contribution methodology is tested.	Reject.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the content of the G97 (City Outcomes Contribution) is refined with consideration of the matters identified.	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.17	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the title 'Responding to whakapapa of place' under the broad title of 'Responding to the natural environment' would be better as 'Responding to context' as many of the matters addressed are responses to the cultural and built environment.	Amend heading 'Responding to whakapapa of place' as follows: <u>'Responding to context'</u>	Accept in part. This heading is recommended to be replaced with "Responding to natural context".	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G1 has two lists and multiple overlapping layers, and that a single much tighter list should be used. Considers that the level of detail required in this guideline will be too much for some projects. Considers that context analysis should be framed around the scope of the project. Considers that there is a focus on existing context but no recognition of planned urban context and character. Considers that when there is no specific requirement to respond to matters such as materials, finishes and textures, this is unnecessary detail.	Amend G1 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: ... "...should include, <u>where relevant</u> , the following:"	Accept in part. G1 is recommended to be amended.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G2 repeats G1 and these two guidelines should be integrated.	Seeks that G1 and G2 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Accept in part. G1 and G2 are recommended to be amended and replaced with new guidelines and a new design outcome.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	G3 is an essential requirement, yet there will be situations where planting at the interface of the public realm is problematic, for example along the Golden Mile.	Not specified.	Reject, no specific decision requested. Although noted that G3 is recommended to be replaced with a guidance point that addresses this concern.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers G3 will place an overemphasis on planting in centres, where it may be inappropriate within the private realm along a retail.	Not specified.	Reject, no specific decision requested. Although noted that G3 is recommended to be replaced with a guidance point that addresses this concern.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.22	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G11 is sound in principle, but is already covered by the Residential Design Guide. Considers that there may be challenges in relying on natural ventilation in the central city context unless there are very strict controls on external noise after hours.	Not specified.	Reject, no specific decision requested. Noted that G11 is recommended to be deleted because it overlaps with building code requirements.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.23	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G14 can't be disagreed with in principle, it is too vague as a direction.	Clarify G14 (Designing with Topography) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part. G14 recommended to be deleted.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G15 should not be included in the Design Guide as this is covered by Council standards.	Seeks that G15 (Designing with Topography) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.	Accept. G15 is recommended to be deleted.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the 'Designing with Water' section of the Design Guide contains unnecessary repetition that will lead to multiple assessments and inefficiencies. Matters relating to water are covered in three sections - G5 (vegetation and planting), G15 (designing with topography) and G16/G17 (designing with water).	Not specified.	Reject in part. The designing with water section is recommended to be retained. Noted that guidelines have been reduced.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G19 overlaps with G2, G4 and G8	Not specified.	Reject, no specific decision requested.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.27	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G20 is sound as an objective, this risks being overly broad as a guideline as it can be taken to mean many different things.	Clarify G20 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part. G20 recommended to be deleted.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.28	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G22 is sound the diagrams are questionable. [Refer to submission for details]	Not specified.	Noted that G22 is recommended to be deleted and integrated into another guidance point, without the diagrams.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.29	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that while G22 is sound the diagrams are questionable. [Refer to submission for details]	Amend the diagrams under G22 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part. Noted that G22 is recommended to be deleted and integrated into another guidance point, without the diagrams.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.30	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the methods identified under G28 may be unnecessary in some instances or too onerous in others.	Not specified.	Accept in part. G28 recommended to be replaced with a new guidance point.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.31	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that passive surveillance is already covered by G21, and then again by G41 and G50.	Seeks that G31 (Passive surveillance) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is removed to avoid unnecessary repetition.	Accept in part. G31 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.32	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G33 is too open and undefined. Queries what is meant by 'an appropriate transition' - i.e. what is the principle to be followed? Considers that the types of open space need to be defined. Considers that if sunlight protection is desirable then that should be a rule.	Clarify G33 (Massing and scale) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part. G33 recommended to be deleted as it is addressed through PDP standards.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.33	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G35 is contrary to design in context and could lead to arbitrary outcomes.	Not specified.	Accept in part. G35 is recommended to be replaced with a new guidance point.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.34	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G42. No specific reason provided.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.35	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that the methods identified under G45 in italics are undefined and open the opportunity of use of ineffective methods.	Not specified.	Reject. The methods in italics in G46 are recommended to be retained.	No.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.36	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G46 repeats G45.	Seeks that G45, G46 and G47 (Roofscape) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Accept in part. G45 is recommended to be replaced, and G46 and G47 are recommended to be deleted as they are addressed elsewhere in the design guide.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.37	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G47 repeats G45 / G46.	Seeks that G45, G46 and G47 (Roofscape) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Accept in part. G45 is recommended to be replaced, and G46 and G47 are recommended to be deleted as they are addressed elsewhere in the design guide.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.38	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the five guidelines under 'Connections for People' should be compressed into fewer guidelines.	Seeks that the five guidelines under 'Connections for People' are compressed into fewer guidelines.	Accept in part. Some of these guidelines are recommended to be deleted or replaced.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.39	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G49 and G53 could be combined into a single guideline.	Seeks that G49 and G53 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Reject. G49 is recommended to be integrated with G15, and G53 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline.	No.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.40	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that passive surveillance is covered multiple times and this should be rationalised.	Not specified.	Accept in part. Passive surveillance guidelines have been recommended to be amended.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the wording of G51 should be amended.	Amend G51 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: Avoid entrancements opportunity for entrapment and minimise blind corners along routes by providing good sightlines and alternative routes	Reject. G51 is recommended to be deleted.	No.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G51 and G52 could be combined into a single guideline.	Seeks that G51 and G52 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Reject. G52 is recommended to be deleted.	No.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G52. No specific reason provided.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Submission point re G53. Combine with G49.	Seeks that G49 and G53 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Accept in part. G49 is recommended to be deleted and integrated into G15, and G53 is recommended to be replaced.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Submission point re G53. Considers that lighting should be covered later. To give certainty, this should better identify the situations where pedestrian connectivity is enhanced.	Clarify G53 (Connections for people) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part. G53 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline.	Yes.
Mclindoe Urban Limited	135.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that while G55 is sound in principle, there may be instances in a centre or mixed use area where it is acceptable to have a car-park, subject to appropriate facade design located at upper levels extending to the street edge and this should be acknowledged - but the guideline and associated illustration preclude this.	Amend G55 (Car-parking and service vehicles) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to allow for parking in some instances.	Reject. G55 is recommended to be deleted.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that lighting is a matter of detail that can be covered by standards and referred to in conditions on a resource consent.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.48	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G62 and G63 cover the same matter and should be combined.	Seeks that G62 and G63 (Lighting) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are combined.	Accept in part. G62 and G63 are recommended too be deleted due to being addressed elsewhere in the design guide.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.49	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G70 identified a list of five matters that need to be considered, and that G71 and G73 are matters of the same order and should be included in that list.	Seeks that the matters under G71 (design of communal areas should maximise their use and enhance their safety and accessibility) and G73 (Consider the design of communal spaces to enhance a sense of place) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide be included in the list under G70 (Open and communal space).	Accept in part. G71 and G73 are recommended to be deleted as the yare addressed elsewhere in the design guide.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.50	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Consider that the focus of G72 only on outdoor space omits consideration of the shared communal facilities that are a useful feature of build to rent and other emerging apartment developments and the content should be modified to recognise that. Notes that the text needs to be amended with no specific details provided.	Seeks that the content of G72 (Open and communal space) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide be amended to allow consideration of shared communal facilities.	Accept in part. G72 is recommended to be deleted as it is addressed elsewhere in the design guide.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.51	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the wording of G77 is ambiguous and that precluding any ventilation from to/from the street is unnecessarily restrictive.	Seeks that G77 (Servicing) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is clarified and amended.	Accept in part. G77 is recommended to be deleted due to overlap with the building code and other parts of this design guide.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.52	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that using the words 'where possible' in G78 could result in negative effects on the site use and particularly on small narrow lots in centres and mixed use zones. Considers that the guideline should instead focus on how such facilities are 'required' in order to avoid adverse effects on the street environment, rather than encouraging on site vehicle access of the type.	Amend G78 (Servicing) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept. G78 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.53	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that G82 is an important guideline and is essential to achieving outcomes that are more than an assemblage of uncoordinated response to a range of guidelines; but that the wording is currently too vague.	Retain G82 (Architectural coherence) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.54	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G82 is an important guideline and is essential to achieving outcomes that are more than an assemblage of uncoordinated response to a range of guidelines; but that the wording is currently too vague.	Amend G82 (Architectural coherence) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to include the following underlined wording, taken from G81 (Wind effects on the public): Provide appropriate solutions to mitigate any impacts of the development on wind or micro-climate within and beyond the site that are functional and do not <u>compromise the coherence and compositional integrity of the building.</u>	Accept in part. G82 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.55	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G87 is unsound and precludes the diagrid buildings that are a feature of innovative contemporary structural and architectural design in Wellington. Further, in an earthquake prone city, expression of strength of a building can be structurally efficiency, psychologically comforting and architecturally viable.	Not specified.	Reject. No specific decision requested.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.56	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point on G88 - considers that exoskeletons, external columns and external bracing elements should not be precluded as these may be the only way of saving existing unsound buildings, and can be successfully achieved,	Seeks that G88 (Seismic bracing/strengthening) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended to identify the qualities that are required, should this approach be taken.	Accept in part. G88 is recommended to be deleted due to overlap with Health and Safety in Employment Act 2015.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.57	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Submission point re G89. No specific reason provided.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that while G90 is sound in principle, the second bullet point is vague and undefined.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.59	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	Considers that the italicised bullet points under G91 address a level of detail that is not provided and should not be necessary at the time of resource consent. These should be deleted.	Amend G91 (Compatibility of uses (Mixed Use)) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: G91. For developments that are likely to be occupied by people with limited mobility, where possible, provide ground level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to New Zealand standards for access and mobility. Consider things such as: - Lever handles on all doors - Easy to reach window sills, power sockets and light switches - Sufficient space to access storage spaces including wardrobes - Ensuring flush levels between rooms, at entryways, and shower access - Ensuring smoke alarms have both visual and audible alerts - Best practice guidance for accessible kitchen, laundry and bathroom design - Best practice standards for signage legibility and colour contrast	Accept in part. G91 is recommended to be replaced with a new guidance point.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.60	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	Considers that G93 requires a level of detail that is unlikely to be known or assessed at the time of resource consent.	Not specified.	Reject. No specific decision requested.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.61	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G95 and G96 are sound in principle but relating to matters of specification and construction methodology and are more properly addressed at the time of building consent.	Seeks that G95 (Waste reduction) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.	Accept. G95 is recommended to be deleted.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.62	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G95 and G96 are sound in principle but relating to matters of specification and construction methodology and are more properly addressed at the time of building consent.	Seeks that G96 (Waste reduction) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.	Accept. G96 is recommended to be deleted.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that G97 relating to City Outcomes Contributions should be deleted.	Seeks that G97 (City Outcomes Contribution) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is deleted.	Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.
Stratum Management Limited	249.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the guideline (G5) appears to introduce requirements additional to the Three Waters chapter.	Remove guideline G5 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide (Vegetation and planting).	Accept in part. G65 is recommended to be replaced with a new guidance point.	Yes.
Stratum Management Limited	249.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the guideline (G8), as worded, will be difficult to apply in a city centre context.	Re-word the guideline G8 (Urban Ecology) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to make it achievable in the city centre context.	Accept in part. G8 is recommended to be deleted as it is addressed elsewhere in the design guides.	Yes.
Stratum Management Limited	249.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the guideline (G69) in relation to the bike storage in respect of the Transport chapter.	Seeks that appropriate qualification is ensured in the guideline G69 (Carbon reduction - site) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept in part. G69 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline.	Yes.
McDonald's	274.76	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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 G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.	Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.45	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.	Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McDonald's	274.77	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Retain Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, subject to amendments outlined other submission points.	Reject. No specific decision requested.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is too vague and should be amended to push for greater analysis of the construction carbon footprint.	Clarify the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to provide greater analysis of the construction carbon footprint.	Accept in part. Carbon reduction guidelines and headings are recommended to be amended.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.227	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.227	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.15	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide should be amended to require a Design Review Panel made of urban planners, architects, landscape architects, lwi and public representatives.	Amend the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to require a Design Review Panel.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.225	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.225	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that inserting the term 'ensure' rather than 'consider' in clause G91 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards.	Amend G91 (Accessibility) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide as follows: For developments that are likely to be occupied by people with limited mobility, where possible, provide ground level access that is accessible by people using wheel chairs, and design units with reference to New Zealand standards for access and mobility. Consider <u>Ensure</u> things such as: ... [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.225	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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, resulting in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Delete Te Aratohu Hoahoa o Ngā Pokapū Whakamahinga Rau - Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.69	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Submission point 349.225 has a similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.102.	Allow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.305	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Reject. It is recommended that a policy is added to several of the Centres and Mixed Use chapters addressing Retirement Villages, which requires fulfillment of the intent of the Centres and Mixed Use design guide.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.123	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because: - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.	Includes reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide in the Introduction as follows: "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".	Reject. Design guides are recommended to remain as statutory document within the plan.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.82	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Plan Part	Support	Submission point 383.123 supports FSNi submission points 476.1, 476.61, and 476.102.	Allow	Reject.	No.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.7	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL 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.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.47	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.124	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Opposes the use of the City Outcomes Contributions for reasons outlined in previous submission points.	Delete G97 and all references to City Outcomes Contributions.	Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.83	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Submission point 383.124 supports FSNi submission points 476.1, 476.61, and 476.102.	Allow	Accept.	No.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.8	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL 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.	Allow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.48	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules over next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.94	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in part. Submitter notes that the design guide is intended to encourage developers to use more sustainable materials to help met the climate change challenge (Strategic Direction Chapter).	Retain the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, with amendment.	Accept. It is recommended that the CMUDG is amended.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.95	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that this guidance should extend to the encouragement of the use of timber as a structural material in high rise buildings to reduce the use of concrete which has a very high carbon cost.	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide be amended as follows: G84 (a) Consider the use of timber as a structural basis for high rise buildings, or words to like effect.	Accept in part. G84 is recommended to be replaced with a new guideline, although not to include the suggested statement.	Yes.
Investore Property Limited	405.139	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	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].	Retain the Design Guides and seeks amendment.	Accept. It is recommended that the CMUDG is amended.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.110	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept insofar as there is agreement to amend the CMUDG.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.110	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept insofar as there is agreement to amend the CMUDG.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.140	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	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. Design guides are recommended to remain as statutory document within the plan.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.111	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.111	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.141	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.	Amend Design Guides to combine the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential Design Guides into a single design guide document.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Investore Property Limited	405.142	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development is inappropriate. Submitter recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, but considers it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects.</p> <p>Considers that 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>Should the City Outcomes Contributions provisions be retained, there needs to be greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	<p>Opposes Table 3 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for attachment].</p>	<p>Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.26	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	<p>Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.</p>		
Investore Property Limited	405.143	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development is inappropriate. Submitter recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, but considers it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects.</p> <p>Considers that 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>Should the City Outcomes Contributions provisions be retained, there needs to be greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment].</p>	<p>Amend Table 3 of Guideline G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide greater clarity and predictability around the City Outcomes points that will be achieved for different outcomes; - Enable a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions achieved by earlier stages of development to be used for later stages of development on the same property. - Change the reference from "public open space" to the defined term "public space"; - Update the comments section to provide objective criteria for outcomes that relate to 'Contribution to Public Space and Amenity'; - Include a set number of points for providing a lane-way or through block connection through a site; - Provide objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in various reuse situations under 'Adaptive reuse of buildings' outcome; - Provide objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in reducing embodied carbon; - Provide objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in relation to different resilience measures; and - Provide objective criteria for 'Urban Design Panel' Outcomes. <p>[Refer to original submission for attachment].</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	<p>Accept.</p> <p>Accept in part. It is recommended that G97 is deleted.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Yes.</p>
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.27	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	<p>Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.</p>	<p>Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.</p>	<p>Accept.</p>	<p>No.</p>

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guy Marriage	407.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that there is a clear need for a Design Review Panel. The mix of the panel would include urban planners, architects, landscape architects, lwi and public representatives. We believe improving the design guide also presents the council with an opportunity to push for greater analysis of the construction carbon footprint.	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in reviewed by a Design Review Panel.	Reject.	No.
Guy Marriage	407.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guides repeat much of what has been raised in the Residential Design Guide, which highlights the need for far more specialization of the Guides.	Seeks that each Design Guide has more specialisation.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.84	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G28 of the Centres and Mixed use design guide lacks practical specificity on how to manage height and scale and that the operative district plan design guidance should be reinstated on this matter.	Amend the design guide to include G3.5 and the associated diagrams from the current Central Area Urban Design Guide	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.248	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.248	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.206	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. Submitter considers that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.	Retain Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97, with amendments.	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.268	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.268	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.207	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. Submitter considers that G97 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes. If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution guideline will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).	Delete Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 if height limits are also deleted.	Accept in part. It is recommended that G97 is deleted.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.269	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.269	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	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?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.208	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide - City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 be amended if floor area ratios are used instead of height standards. Amend to allow greater additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required) if the relevant outcomes are achieved.	Accept in part. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution mechanism is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.270	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.270	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.209	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Supports Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that if Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide City Outcomes Contribution guideline G97 is retained, it should be re-phrased so that, rather than "Require over and under height" developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions, the height limit for developments is varied where City Outcomes Contributions are achieved. The change of phrasing reflects the possibility that, as currently proposed, over and under height developments still have a theoretical pathway to obtain a restricted discretionary consent without achieving City Outcomes Contributions. It would also make it clearer that the developer providing the outcome is entitled to the increase in height (or floor area).	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.271	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.271	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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.	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?
Fabric Property Limited	425.106	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, 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.</p> <p>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 does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, 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, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Opposes the inclusion of the Design Guides within the Proposed District Plan and seeks that these sit outside the Plan as external reference documents.	Reject. It is recommended that the design guides are a statutory document that sit within the plan.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.30	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the 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, as they 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 line with The RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.30	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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, as they 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 line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.107	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, 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.</p> <p>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 does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, 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, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Seeks that all direct references to design guides in the City Centre Zone provisions are replaced with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.31	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the 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, as they 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 line with The RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.31	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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, as they 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 line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.108	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, 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.</p> <p>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 does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.</p> <p>Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, 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, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide".</p> <p>Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.</p>	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and Residential Design Guide are combined into one Design Guide.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.32	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the 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, as they 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 line with The RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.32	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	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, as they 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 line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.109	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>If the references to the City Outcomes Contributions are to be retained, considers that there needs to be greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. As notified, there is a wider range of points set out for different "outcomes" with little detail provided on how these will be allocated or scored. While many developments may achieve the outcomes set out in Table 3 regardless, it will be difficult for applicants to design developments to achieve these outcomes when it is unclear how points will be awarded for many of the outcomes. For example, in providing a lane-way or public amenities when it could be awarded anywhere between 1-10 or 1-5 points and there is no objective criteria as to how points are awarded.</p> <p>Submitter has provided more comments on Table 3 in Appendix C of their original submission to identify how Table 3 could be amended to provide certainty and clarity for the Council and applicants in how points will be awarded.</p>	<p>If the Proposed District Plan retains provisions relating to the City Outcomes Contribution:</p> <p>Seeks that Table 3 of G97 in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended to provide greater clarity and predictability around the City Outcomes points that will be achieved for different outcomes.</p> <p>[See Appendix C of original submission for amendments to Table 3]</p>	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.110	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to the design guides to anticipate situations where a consent holder will provide a City Outcomes Contribution for current and future stages of a staged development, and receive a credit toward future stages. This should be a codified system in which points achieved but not needed by a development are recorded against a property for use for a later project. This would encourage comprehensive development to take a future-focussed approach in light of the outcomes sought in the design guides.</p> <p>It is appropriate that points be retained as credits to reflect that outcomes have been achieved which have community benefits, and significant investment may have been undertaken in order to achieving points under Table 3.</p> <p>This is important for the redevelopment of a large site where City Outcomes Contributions are provided and credits earned on early stages but not used in that stage, and therefore should be available to be used in future stages.</p>	<p>If the Proposed District Plan retains provisions relating to the City Outcomes Contribution:</p> <p>Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide is amended to enable a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions achieved by earlier stages of development to be used for later stages of development on the same property.</p>	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Johnsonville Community Association	429.41	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers that large-scale developments will likely have adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>It is unclear what would enable a development to meet the criteria of "satisfying the relevant design guide".</p> <p>Considers that it is unfair to encourage developments by rewarding height increases beyond PDP maximums.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.	Accept. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Supports in general the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Not specified.	Reject. No specific decision requested.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.66	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide should be a reference document that sits outside of the district plan and referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way: "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide"	Delete all direct references to the design guides in the Metropolitan Centre Zone provisions and replace with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Reject in part. References to the CMUDG in the centres chapters are recommended to be amended in lieu of changes to the design guides.	Yes.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.67	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides.	Seeks that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential Design Guides are combined into a single design guide document.	Reject.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.68	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose	<p>Opposes the 'City Outcomes Contributions' in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.</p> <p>Considers that there is a wider range of points set out for different "outcomes" with little detail provided on how these will be allocated or scored.</p> <p>Considers that it will be difficult for applicants to design developments to achieve these outcomes when it is unclear how points will be awarded for many of the outcomes.</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. G97 is recommended to be removed because city outcomes contribution is addressed in the PDP.	Yes.
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.31	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support	Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values.	Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety.	Accept.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.69	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers appropriate that as an alternative to removing references to 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides, that changes to G97 are necessary.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need for greater clarity and predictability provided under Table 3 (G97). Considers that there is little detail provided on how the different outcomes will be allocated or scored.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks alternative to the preferred relief of remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides.</p> <p>Seeks to amend Table of G97 of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to provide greater clarity and predictability around the City Outcomes points that will be achieved for different outcomes, in light of the submitter's comments in Appendix B.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for attachment].</p>	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.70	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	<p>Considers appropriate that as an alternative to removing references to 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides, to replace a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions.</p> <p>Considers appropriate that where points are awarded for the current stage of a development, that this should be able to be used as credits at later stages of development (of a staged development) or for future projects.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks alternative to the preferred relief of remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides.</p> <p>Seeks to amend the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide to enable a codified system for credits for City Outcomes Contributions achieved by earlier stages of development to be used for later stages of development on the same property.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for attachment].</p>	Reject. G97 is recommended to be deleted as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.71	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that 'public space' should be used instead of 'public open space'.	Amend Table 3 as follows: .. For every 10% of the site accessible as public open space [Inferred decision requested]	Reject. G97 and Table 3 are recommended to be deleted.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.72	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed for outcome of 'For every 10% of the site accessible as public open space'. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject. G97 and Table 3 are recommended to be deleted.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.73	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be a set number of points for providing a lane-way or through block connection through a site, for outcome 'Any lane-way or through block connection'. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part. It is recommended that there is a guideline for pedestrian paths through larger sites.	Yes.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.74	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed for outcome of 'Provision of appropriate communal gardens, playgrounds, and roof gardens'. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject. G97 and Table 3 are recommended to be deleted.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.75	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed for outcome of 'Provision of permanent public amenities, i.e. public toilets'. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject. G97 and Table 3 are recommended to be deleted.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.76	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in various reuse situations, for the outcome of "Adaptive reuse of buildings". [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part. Carbon reduction heading is amended to Adaptive Reuse.	Yes.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.77	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in relation to embodied carbon, for the outcome of "Reduction in embodied carbon in buildings". [Inferred decision requested]	Reject. References to embodied carbon are recommended to be removed.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.78	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there should be objective criteria or guidance on the number of points that can be awarded in relation to different resilience measures, for the outcome of "Additional seismic resilience measures, including base isolations, seismic dampers, etc.". [Inferred decision requested]	Reject. The points system is recommended to be removed.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.79	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that objective criteria is needed, for the outcome of "Urban Design Panel Approval". [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.61	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Oppose in part	Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution and seeks that it be removed from the plan in its entirety.	Delete the City Outcomes Contribution (G97) from the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Accept.	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.103	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Support in part	Considers that 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section is useful for some developments, supermarkets are designed and constructed for a specific activity therefore the guidance should recognise also the functional and operational requirements of activities and development, i.e. practicalities such as servicing, storage and rubbish bins.	Amend 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section as follows: Buildings in Centres and the Central area are designed to facilitate multiple uses and changes in use over time <u>while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.104	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Amend	Considers that 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section is useful for some developments, supermarkets are designed and constructed for a specific activity therefore the guidance should recognise also the functional and operational requirements of activities and development, i.e. practicalities such as servicing, storage and rubbish bins.	Amend 'The internal spaces' (page 10 Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide) section as follows: Buildings in Centres and the Central area are designed to facilitate multiple uses and changes in use over time <u>while recognising the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.</u>	Reject.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.96	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the Commercial and Mixed Use Design guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.68	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide	Amend	Considers that G12 and G13 say more or less than same thing and should be combined to avoid repetition.	Seeks that G12 and G13 (Designing with Topography) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated.	Accept in part.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Nick Ruane	61.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the concept of Universal Design requires a definition in the PDP as it is referenced.	Add a definition for 'UNIVERSAL DESIGN' as follows: "Universal Design is the design and composition of an environment so that it can be accessed, understood and used to the greatest extent possible by all people regardless of their age, size, ability or disability. An environment (or any building, product, or service in that environment) should be designed to meet the needs of all people who wish to use it. This is not a special requirement, for the benefit of only a minority of the population. It is a fundamental condition of good design."	Reject.	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.	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.	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.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.3	Whole PDP / 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.	No.
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that mistakes have been made regarding design of buildings in the past - for example the Copthorne Hotel and Bay Plaza. Considers a design control process could prevent badly designed buildings from being built and to ensure a sustainable and enjoyable place to live.	Seeks the addition of an effective design control process for the district plan implementation.	Accept in part.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.68	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide throughout zones does not require evaluation for consistency with the design guide and could be strengthened. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide provides direction on carbon reduction, urban design, stormwater, ecology, water conservation and freshwater ecosystem health, which are all contribute to achieving the PDP's strategic objectives. The Design Guide's weight as a matter of discretion should therefore reflect this. We acknowledge that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.	Seeks to strengthen reference to Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.	Accept in part. References to CMUDG in CMU chapters are recommended to be amended.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.54	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow / Disallow the submission point to the extent that it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.54	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow / Disallow the submission point to the extent that it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Supports the endeavour to make the design guides more simplified and accessible as well as limiting the potential for different interpretations.	Retain Design Guides as notified.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.1	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the suite of design guides in the PDP need considerable editing and tightening up to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the PDP. Considers that the suite of design guides in the PDP are too long and unnecessarily complicated, and the content needs to be reassessed and edited. Considers that the design guides need to be to the point and easy to use, and the proposed design guides don't achieve this.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.85	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the review of the design guides but also seeks that the design guides are taken out of the District Plan and provided as a non-statutory guidance. If Design Guides are retained in the Plan, the plan provisions need to be clear to identify the key outcomes sought rather than full compliance with the entire suite of design guides. Any consequential changes to plan provisions resulting from amendments to design guides and their referencing is also sought.	Disallow / Seeks that Design Guides are taken out of the Plan and provided as non-statutory guidance. If Design Guides are retained in the Plan, the plan provisions need to be clear to identify the key outcomes sought rather than full compliance with the entire suite of design guides. Any consequential changes to plan provisions resulting from amendments to design guides and their referencing is also sought.	Reject.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.2	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the specific amendments requested to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and Residential Design Guide in the submission should be applied to all of the design guides.	Seeks that all Design Guides are subject to a high level of scrutiny and refinement.	Accept.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.3	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that as the design guides overlap and assessments will be required against more than one Design Guide, unnecessary complication will occur, particularly when repeated over multiple sites.	Seeks that the entire suite of Design Guides is restructured and coordinated to remove unnecessary overlap and repetition between the design guides.	Accept.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.4	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that for small developments the full Design Guide may not be relevant and the level of assessment required will not be fit for purpose, being unnecessarily onerous and inefficient.	Seeks that the entire suite of Design Guides is restructured and coordinated to remove unnecessary overlap and repetition between the Design Guides.	Accept.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.5	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that there is no mechanism for departing from the guidelines or clarity on how this will be assessed.	Seeks that the Design Guides include mechanism for departure from the guidelines, which should be tied into identified, relevant and numbered objectives or outcomes.	Reject.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.6	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the outcomes are identified as being part of this statutory document and must be met. Therefore these should be numbered to allow cross reference in assessments.	Seeks that the 'outcomes' in each design guide are numbered and integrate with the relevant section / guidelines to avoid flipping back and forth between Design Guides.	Accept. The outcomes have been reordered within the revised design guides.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the same set of outcomes appears in each of the Design Guides, in addition to the 16 page Introduction to the Design Guides. This is unnecessary repetition and has the effect of bloating the suite of guides.	Not specified.	Reject. Majority of the outcomes are aligned but a select few differ where necessary for the differing purposes of these design guides.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.9	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that repetition should be eliminated from the Design Guides because the degree of overlap and repetition makes the document unnecessarily long, unwieldy and inefficient to apply. Because a point is made multiple times may not necessarily lead to efficient application, and it could give undue and unintended over-emphasis to some design direction. This would allow the design guides to be materially shortened without loss of content, and the task of applying them made considerably more efficient.	Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines.	Accept.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.10	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that in many cases a matter is dealt with in a section by multiple guidelines, when it would be equally effective and more efficient to combine into a reduced number of guidelines. An example is Residential GG99, G101 and G102	Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines.	Accept in part.	No.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the guidelines in the design guides should be edited to ensure consistency of expression. Many are directive such as maintain visual connection..., Orientate building frontages; Use planting to..... But others are passive descriptive statements. Considers that the approach of being directive is preferred as it will enhance legibility and it will also allow the text to be shortened.	Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines.	Accept in part.	Yes.
McIndoe Urban Limited	135.12	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose in part	Considers that the Design Guides inappropriately combine good practice in detailed building design, specification and construction which are properly covered at the time of building consent with issues which relate to the design, configuration and amenity effects of the building. Those matters should be stripped out as they require a level of detail that is inappropriate to develop and provide before resource consent is granted. That is due to the cost of providing that information in a situation where it may be quite uncertain whether a consent can/will be achieved.	Seeks that requirements for detailed information on construction, materials, services that is only reasonably developed following receipt of resource consent are removed.	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guides. [Specific Design Guides not referenced]	Retain the Design Guides as notified.	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.59	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution - referenced in the Design Guides and PDP	Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contribution are removed from the Design Guides and Proposed District Plan policies.	Accept in part. G97 is recommended to be deleted, as the city outcomes contribution is addressed elsewhere in the plan.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Amos Mann	172.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that accessibility and universal design requirements are provided for in the Design Guides and in incentives.	Accept in part.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.6	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.6	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports making design guides clear and concise to facilitate easier access and accessible knowledge about design standards.	Seeks that design guides are clear and concise to facilitate easier access and accessible knowledge about design standards.	Accept in part. The design guides are recommended to be streamlined.	Yes.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.45	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that design guides reward the use of environmentally sustainable building materials to promote climate friendly development.	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.46	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Supports and emphasises the importance of current, new, and renovation toward high-performance Buildings.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.47	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that partnering with mana whenua especially for high impact urban developments is essential to weaving te ao Māori throughout the urban landscape.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Alan Fairless	242.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.	Reject.	No.
Alan Fairless	242.25	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that Wellington is a folded landscape with valleys and ridges, where a single large dwelling in the wrong place can adversely affect many others. The Plan needs to allow and adjust for this reality by adopting a more carefully tailored and locally nuanced approach, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach. Planning needs to drive and encourage quality and ensure the design of new, more intensive development works with the city's idiosyncratic landscape and for the communities in which it is located.	Seeks that the District Plan strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas.	Reject.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.42	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that for apartment developments both the Residential Design Guide and Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide will apply, with over 200 guidelines to be considered and work through.	Seeks rationalisation of the Mixed Use Design Guide to reduce the number of guidelines as much as possible.	Accept in part. The CMUDG is recommended to be amended to reduce the amount of guidelines.	Yes.
Stratum Management Limited	249.43	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Considers that the ranking of guidelines within the Design Guides is appropriate.	Retain ranking system in Design Guides as notified.	Reject. The ranking system is recommended to be removed.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.44	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that it is unclear what the 'Outcomes' section of each Design Guide attempts to achieve.	Seeks that the 'Outcomes' that read as policies are included as policies, if that is the intention; alternatively deletion or appropriate qualification of the 'Outcomes'.	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.75	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers 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 amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the PDP and for the relevant provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.182	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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 but opposes relevant provisions instead referring to specific design guidelines to the extent these provisions apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from any specific design principles as sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.182	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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 but opposes relevant provisions instead referring to specific design guidelines to the extent these provisions apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from any specific design principles as sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan.	Seeks reinstatement of the operative district plan design guidance for minimum sunlight access [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Carolyn Stephens	344.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the plan should strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that urban design qualities be strengthened in Design Guides.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.333	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers the design guides are one part of how the District Plan can give effect to the NPS-FM, and should rate freshwater matters with appropriate weight throughout the guides. The current ratings for guidelines for stormwater, freshwater bodies and water conservation are currently rated as having lowest weight in the residential design guide for example.	Seeks that Design Guides are amended as necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM, including by rating freshwater guidelines to recognise their importance.		
						accept in part	no
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.19	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Agree that the Design Guides can give effect to the NPS-FM and should prioritise measures that enhance freshwater and water conservation.	Allow	accept	no
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.65	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	reject	no
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.65	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	reject	no
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.335	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the Regional Standard for Water Services should be referenced directly through design guides, which provides technical engineering detail and contains specific infrastructure requirements for development.	Seeks to reference the Regional Standard for Water Services in Design Guides.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.67	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.67	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.336	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the Regional Standard for Water Services is not referenced directly through design guides, which provides technical engineering detail and contains specific infrastructure requirements for development.	Seeks to ensure emphasis on water conservation throughout guides, including mandate for the use of rainwater tanks and other best practices for water conservation such as low-flow devices, in new developments	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.68	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.68	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Woolworths New Zealand	359.95	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that urban design aspirations in Design Guides should not be used as a veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones, specifically supermarkets. The submitter considers that the inclusion of reference to Design Guides as matters of discretion in the PDP with respect to development in Centres and Mixed-Use zones and in terms of Signs elevates their statutory relevance whilst introducing a subjective yet prescriptive assessment framework that gives rise to uncertainty and unnecessary complexity in consenting, even with generally anticipated restricted discretionary activities. Specific to supermarkets, which are typically larger in scale than regular high street or boutique retail, building bulk and scale is a function of supermarkets' unique operational and functional requirements, which themselves can still be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location, however to a different standard than currently outlined in the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide.	Seeks that Design Guides are not used as a veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones, specifically supermarkets.	reject	no
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.28	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Submission point 359.95 (Design Guides General) has similar outcomes to FSNI submission point 476.1 and 476.102.	Allow	reject	no
Woolworths New Zealand	359.96	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the status of the notification of these Guides, as well as their bearing on subsequent legal weighting as the plan-making process continues should be clarified. The PDP states that these Design Guides have been notified using the ISPP process, however, they have been referenced in the context of parts of the PDP which have been notified under both the ISPP process and the P1 Sch1 process. The status of these Guides would appear to be statutory by reference within the matters of discretion of relevance. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating these Guides to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment. In the proposed consenting framework this means that the design of supermarket buildings will be considered against all matters within these Guides (which have been ranked via a rating system). The subjective nature of the Design Guides and their inclusion as matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities is opposed by Woolworths as it is considered that restricted discretionary consent applications should be straightforward with clear discretion parameters. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks clarification on the status of the notification of Design Guides, as well as their subsequent legal weighting.	Accept in part. The Design Guides are recommended to be streamlined and have more certainty added to their directiveness of any given guideline.	No.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.18	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design. This is to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect to urban design.	Reject.	No.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.19	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that the plan should strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that urban design qualities be strengthened in Design Guides.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.516	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Generally supportive.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.765	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose in part	The inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan is opposed, as they act as de facto rules to be complied with. Any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan is opposed. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, it is sought that that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.	Remove Design Guides from within the District Plan, as well as any references or requirements related to Design Guides. Treat Design Guides as non-statutory tools, outside of the District Plan.	Reject. It is recommended that design guides remain statutory and within the plan.	No.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.24	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Submitter 391 seeks to omit references to Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide from the Plan. The Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide are important for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criteria.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.128	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
LIVE WELLington	FS96.45	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.44	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.165	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.165	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.766	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that Design Guidelines should sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. (Option A)	Seeks that a note be added in the District Plan as follows: <u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u>	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.166	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.166	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.767	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that design guidelines should be amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development. (Option B)	Amend Design Guidelines to clarify and simplify them. [See original submission for further details].	Accept. It is recommended that the design guides are amended to reduce the amount of guidelines and be more directive.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.167	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.167	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.768	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that Kāinga Ora should get the opportunity to review Design Guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document. (Option C)	Seeks that Kāinga Ora be allowed to review Design Guidelines.	Reject. Noted that Kāinga Ora was present for the Design Guide conferencing.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.168	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.168	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.138	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	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. Design guides are recommended to remain as statutory documents within the plan.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.109	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.109	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Guy Marriage	407.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that a multi-unit specific design guide is much needed. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of a Multi-Unit Design Guide.	Reject.	No.
Guy Marriage	407.9	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that while the Facades section of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide has 4 points listed under Facades (and no such Star system **) and 9 points regarding Artificial Lighting, there is no associated rating for Natural Lighting, or Sunlight and that all these points need to be related.	Seeks that points on Facades, Artificial Lighting, Natural Lighting and Sunlight need to be related.	Reject.	No.
Cheryl Robilliard	409.7	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Retain Design Guides as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
VicLabour	414.52	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that accessibility needs to be a key focus throughout the plan.	Seeks that the Council considers recommendations from disabled people and advocates and explore co-design with remuneration where appropriate.	Accept in part.	No.
VicLabour	414.53	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports references to waste minimisation.	Seeks that provisions for waste minimisation should be strengthened where possible	Reject.	No.
VicLabour	414.57	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the design guides include direction that within walking catchments of the central city transport links car parking may not be required, with emphasis on accessibility.	Reject.	No.
VicLabour	414.58	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports sustainable building and considers more can be done.	Seeks that a low emissions design guide be made compulsory.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.197	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Supports the intent of the Design Guides, their inclusion in the PDP significantly expands the matters Council must consider when exercising its discretion and, perversely, may even limit Council's flexibility to promote quality design outcomes. While well-intentioned, the Design Guides may become a 'tick-box' exercise and may discourage innovation. Our proposal is to make the Design Guides nonstatutory; they should be a useful 'how-to' resource (for example, like the Auckland Design Manual) which developers and Council can turn to when considering the design of new developments. It also provides more flexibility to adjust the Guides over time, as requirements and preferred design outcomes evolve, without requiring a plan change process.	Supports the intent of the design guides, but seeks that these are non-statutory.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.198	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Supports the intent of the Design Guides, their inclusion in the PDP significantly expands the matters Council must consider when exercising its discretion and, perversely, may even limit Council's flexibility to promote quality design outcomes. While well-intentioned, the Design Guides may become a 'tick-box' exercise and may discourage innovation. Our proposal is to make the Design Guides nonstatutory; they should be a useful 'how-to' resource (for example, like the Auckland Design Manual) which developers and Council can turn to when considering the design of new developments. It also provides more flexibility to adjust the Guides over time, as requirements and preferred design outcomes evolve, without requiring a plan change process.	Amend the Design Guides to be non-statutory [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.261	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.261	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.200	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and the submitter does not consider that it meets the section 32 Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Submitter suggests that Council may wish to include the maximum building depth provision in a non statutory Design Guide.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.262	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.262	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.201	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	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 G114-116 (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.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.103	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Submission point 416.201 supports submission points 476.1 & 476.102.	Allow	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.263	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.263	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.202	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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 G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).	Seeks that if the Design Guides are to be retained, the Design Guides should be significantly pared back and reviewed for double-up / alignment with the objectives and policies in Part 3.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.264	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.264	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.203	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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 G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).	Seeks that if the Design Guides are to be retained, the Design Guides should be significantly pared back and reviewed for double-up / alignment with the objectives and policies in Part 3.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.265	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.265	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.204	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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 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 G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).	Seeks that Council consider a Design Excellence Panel (or similar) which is constituted for each project (with representatives agreed by Council and the developer) and is charged with ensuring the development achieves the quality urban outcomes sought by Council. Submitter notes that provided approval is obtained from the Design Excellence Panel, Council would not have discretion to consider urban outcomes (to ensure there is no overlap of roles between Council and the Design Excellence Panel).	Accept in part.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.266	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.266	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.105	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, 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. 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 does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications. Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, 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, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide". Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document.	Seeks that Design Guides are removed from the Proposed District Plan and used as external reference documents.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.29	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the 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, as they 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 line with The RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.29	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	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, as they 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 line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Miriam Moore	433.20	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Support of the design guides holding statutory weight as a matter of discretion in the PDP.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept in part.	No.
Miriam Moore	433.21	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Considers that assessments against the Design Guide(s) could take extra time in the consenting process. Seeks that the Council is well-resourced in Design Review, and works well with developers to get good and timely outcomes. Hopes the enforcement of design guides can achieve a good number of accessible homes - Auckland's similar intensification rules have resulted in many multi-storey terraced homes, while these are good compact designs for family homes, they exclude our ageing population and those who aren't able bodied. Believes Wellington needs density to be inclusive and done well to bring those on board, who may be nervous about the changes coming.	Seeks consent efficiency.	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?
Paul M Blaschke	435.11	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support	Supports the widespread use of Design Guides and their inclusion in the statutory plan.	Retain Design Guides as notified.	Reject.	No.
Marilyn Head	457.8	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers the landscaping standards to be too low. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.14	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to amend design guide as enough capability in the current plan to accommodate the projected population growth.	Seeks to amend the design guides. [inferred decision requested].	Accept.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	Supports in general the intent and provisions of the design guides.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Amend	Considers that it is important that design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan. Including them in the district plan elevates them into standards, rather than guidance. Considers that it is not appropriate to provide that the council's discretion is restricted to all matters in design guides. The design guides do not provide any clear direction or certainty for applicants and it is onerous to potentially need to address two design guides.	Seeks that the design guides are used as reference documents which sit outside of the district plan	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.102	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Support in part	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.	Remove the design guides from the plan and instead revise provisions to refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Reject.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.62	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that there are no blank frontages.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.174	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.174	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.63	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that entryways are designed so people entering buildings can move off the public space while they do that (e.g. while they find their keys or seek permission to enter).	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.175	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.175	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.64	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that the worst possible outcome for pedestrians is that they are in a cold, wet space that never dries out in winter because it never gets any sun.	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that buildings do not unduly shade public space unless they are providing a verandah.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.176	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.176	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Not specified	Considers that there are a number of buildings in Wellington that generate their own weather in the adjacent public square eg. Majestic Centre.	Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that design does not generate wind problems.	Reject. This matter is addressed by the Wind chapter of the PDP.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.177	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.177	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Historic Places Wellington	182.31	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that the design guides as notified are too 'loose'.	Seeks a new multi unit design guide to ensure that new development is well designed and will complement the predominant patterns of local neighbourhoods. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.72	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it 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.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.72	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it 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.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Historic Places Wellington	182.32	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Not specified	Considers that urban design panels could be used as part of the assessment process [of the new multi unit design guide]. [Refer to original submission].	Not specified.	Reject, no specific decision requested.	No.
Alan Fairless	242.26	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that local Design Guides, founded on a sophisticated understanding of local character, are a proven and effective vehicle for addressing good residential quality.	Seeks that local design guides, tailored to local areas, are created and used to strengthen the urban design qualities of the city. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.5	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.5	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.13	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that the Multi-Unit Design Guide should be reinstated, or otherwise brought back in a revised form.	Seeks that the Multi-Unit Design Guide be reinstated.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.226	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.226	Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.65	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that an Aro Valley specific design guide which applies to all new developments within the existing character areas (as identified in the Operative Plan) should be instated.	Reinstate the Operative Plan's Design Guide specific to Aro Valley.	Reject.	No.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.16	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	Considers that there will never be another chance to include this in a building than when it is built. Considers that retrofitting will be expensive.	Seeks that water conservation would be madatory in design guides. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.49	Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Design Guides are introduced for all verandahs. [Refer to original submission for full guidance on verandah design guide notes].	Reject.	No.