

**Wellington City District Plan – Omnibus Plan Change**  
**Commercial and Mixed Use Zones – Quality Development Outcomes Policy**  
**CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7, NCZ-P7**

**Scope of Proposed Change**

To amend the 'Quality Development Outcomes' policies within the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone chapters (CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7) to assist with Plan implementation, and achieve consistency across the chapters.

**Background**

The 2024 District Plan enables significant additional building heights throughout its suite of Commercial and Mixed Use Zones (CMUZ), within a policy framework that seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality. CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 (Quality development outcomes) is applied consistently across the CMUZ to new buildings, and additions and alterations to existing buildings. The City Centre Zone (CCZ) policy is shown below:

**CCZ-P9 Quality development outcomes**

*Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development, at a site scale to positively contribute to the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the City Centre Zone by:*

1. *Fulfilling the intent of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide;*
2. *Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development:*
  - a. *Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood;*
  - b. *Optimises the development capacity of the land, including sites that are large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking areas;*
  - c. *Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation anticipated;*
  - d. *Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; and*
  - e. *Is accessible for emergency service vehicles;*
3. *Ensuring that development, where relevant:*
  - a. *Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to:*
    - i. *A scheduled site of significance to Māori;*
    - ii. *A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area;*
    - iii. *An identified character precinct;*
    - iv. *A listed public space;*
    - v. *Residential zones;*
    - vi. *Open space zones; and*
    - vii. *The Waterfront Zone;*
  - b. *Responds to the pedestrian scale of narrower streets;*
  - c. *Responds to any identified significant natural hazard risks and climate change effects, including the strengthening and adaptive reuse of existing buildings;*
  - d. *Provides a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment;*
  - e. *Enhances the quality of the streetscape and the private/public interface;*
  - f. *Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport activity movement networks, including planned rapid transit stops;*
  - g. *Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted to a range of activities, including residential along streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements; and*
  - h. *Positively contributes to the sense of place and distinctive form of the City Centre where the site or proposal will be prominent.*
4. *Recognising the benefits of well-designed accessible, resilient and sustainable development, including the extent to which the development:*

- a. *Enables universal accessibility within buildings, ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/disability; and*
- b. *Incorporates a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change and earthquake resilience; and*
- c. *Incorporates construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs.*

The policy went through several iterations in response to submissions.

The Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) largely adopted officer recommendations in relation to amending the policy. Notably, a new matter requiring consideration of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide (CMUDG) was added as point 1 (as shown above). This change was applied consistently to CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7. Concurrently, references to the CMUDG as a matter of discretion within any applicable rules were removed (as the policies themselves are a matter of discretion) and a fully revised Design Guide was introduced.

The IHP also changed the name of the policy from '*City Design Outcomes*' to '*City Development Outcomes*'.

For further context and relevant statutory and 2024 District Plan information refer to the CMUZ Regulatory and Policy Direction Assessment.

#### Issue

The policy is complex with many components. A number of minor implementation issues have been identified. Additionally, there are a small number of inconsistencies across the policies that were not intended and need amending to provide consistency across the CMUZ chapters.

The issue includes the following components:

1. That clause 2.a of MCZ-P7 requires that the design of development '*reflects the nature of scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive development of the **centre***', but not the wider **neighbourhood**, inclusive of the surrounding residential areas which themselves will undergo change through the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) provisions. This is different to the equivalent clause in the equivalent policy CCZ-P9, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 all require consideration of both the '*evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood*'.
2. That a hyperlink at clause 3.a.iv of CCZ-P9, directs Plan users to the definition of '*public space*' and not to Appendix 9 (being the listed public spaces that the clause is requiring development responds to). Not having a hyperlink to the relevant appendix creates uncertainty which public spaces are intended.
3. That there are instances of missing punctuation throughout the policies.

Further background information relating to each of these matters is provided in this assessment.

## Assessment of Options

The following assessment sets out whether or not amendments to the provisions are necessary for improved Plan implementation and consistency.

### Relevant Options

For the purposes of this evaluation, the following options have been considered in relation to each of the issues identified within the policies:

- **Option 1:** Retain the status quo, with no amendments to CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7; or
- **Option 2:** Amend the policies to address the issue.

### Cost/Benefit Assessment

The options are assessed in the table below. A single analysis is provided for Option 1. The analysis of Option 2 is separated to address each recommended change.

#### Option 1: Retain the status quo (no amendments to the policies)

The first component of the issue is considered to be the most significant in that it will change how the Metropolitan Centre Zone (MCZ) policy will be applied:

- 1. That clause 2.a of MCZ-P7 (Quality development outcomes) only requires consideration of the centre and not the adjoining residential zone, whereas CCZ-P9, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 all require consideration of both the centre and the residential context.

The retention of MCZ-P7.2.a in its current form has the potential to impose unintended constraints on development potential, as it could be interpreted to mean that while development within the MCZ is expected to intensify (particularly with respect to building height), there will not be a corresponding increase in the adjoining residential zones. If interpreted in such a way, an assessment could be overly restrictive and unfavourable for a development on the boundary between the MCZ and surrounding residential land where intensification is also enabled by the Plan.

The costs and benefits associated with retaining the current clause are shown below.

Costs	Benefits
<i>Environmental</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Failure to recognise the broader intensification settings of the District Plan, which enable changes to the built form and scale of urban development (over time) to create well-functioning urban environments.</li></ul> <i>Economic</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Uncertainty of implementation will result in increased economic costs preparing and processing resource consent applications.</li></ul>	<i>Environmental</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are no environmental benefits that haven't been previously identified in the section 32 reports prepared for the Proposed District Plan (PDP)<sup>1</sup>.</li></ul> <i>Economic</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There are no economic benefits that have not been previously identified.</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup> Refer to CMUZ Regulatory and Policy Direction Assessment for details.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barriers to maximising the development of the MCZ will have implications for the economic viability of the MCZ.</li> </ul> <p><i>Social</i></p> <p>Failure to recognise that intensification is enabled both in and around the MCZ may inadvertently limit commercial and residential development in these centres. The social implication is that housing, and access to the level of services that a MCZ provides, will not be available for people who seek to live in this context.</p> <p><i>Cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no cultural costs that have not been previously identified.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Social</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognising that maximum building height limits in both MCZ have increased substantially, local residents may see the clause as a useful mechanism for protecting existing levels of amenity. Hence retaining this barrier may have a perceived social benefit in terms of reducing uncertainty, particularly for adjacent residential properties.</li> </ul> <p><i>Cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no cultural benefits that have not been previously identified.</li> </ul>
<p>The remaining components of the issue are considered minor, will assist with Plan consistency and will not change how the <i>‘Quality development outcomes’</i> policies across the suite of CMUZ chapters will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2. That a hyperlink at clause 1.a.iv of the CCZ policy, directing plan users to Appendix 9 (being the listed public spaces that the clause is requiring development responds to).</li> <li>- 3. That there are instances of missing punctuation throughout the policies.</li> </ul> <p>Given the minor nature of these issues, retaining the status quo does not give rise to any significant environmental, economic, social or cultural costs or benefits. The operation of the policies remains efficient and effective as they are. No detailed assessment of costs and benefits has been undertaken.</p> <p>However, retaining the status this is not the preferred option as the changes recommended at Option 2 below provide for improved implementation and Plan user experience.</p>	
<p><i>Effectiveness and efficiency</i></p> <p>When considering CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 in their entirety, the amendments to the policies will improve the effectiveness of interpretation, with resulting efficiencies for developers seeking resource consent where consideration of the applicable policy is required. The recommended changes to the policies, as detailed later in this report, will also provide clarity for property owners in the surrounding context, including in the adjoining residential zones.</p>	
<p><i>Overall evaluation of Option 1</i></p> <p>For these reasons, retaining the status quo is not considered to be the best option to address the overarching issue, being to resolve minor implementation issues and provide for consistencies across the CMUZ.</p>	

## Option 2: To amend CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7

### Option 2.a - Amend clause 2.a of MCZ-P7.

At present, the policy is as follows (emphasis added):

*Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by:*

2. *Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development:*
  - a. *Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled **within the zone** and responds to the evolving, **more intensive identity of the centre**;*

This policy gives effect to MCZ-O3 (Amenity and Design):

*Medium and high density mixed-use development is achieved that contributes to a good quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Metropolitan Centres Zone.*

Firstly, it is noted that to provide consistency with LCZ-O3 and NCZ-O2 it is recommended in a separate assessment that MCZ-O3 is amended as follows:

*Medium and high density mixed-use development is achieved that contributes to a good quality, well-functioning urban environment that reflects the changing urban form and amenity values of the Metropolitan Centres ~~Zone~~ and their surrounding residential areas.*

A well-functioning urban environment includes both the centre and the residential context within which it sits. The 2024 District Plan enables significant increased development capacity within both the CMUZ and the residential zones adjoining these.

It was intended that assessment of development against MCZ-P7 (and the equivalent CMUZ policies) would recognise that the realisation of Plan-enabled development potential will significantly alter the scale and nature of development both within and around centres over time. Additionally, the intention of this clause is to prevent creating an unintended barrier to intensification where existing residential development is of a lesser scale (especially on the boundary of CMUZ and residential zones), on the basis that this is also expected to intensify, particularly in the HRZ adjoining both the Johnsonville and Kilbirnie MCZ.

As demonstrated in bold above, the first part of MCZ-P7 clause 2.a relates to development within the zone as well as the second part. The equivalent clauses 2.a of CCZ-P9, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 all refer to both the centre as well as the broader spatial area of the 'neighbourhood'. Given that the equivalent policies in centres zones both above and below in the centres hierarchy have consistent drafting referencing this broader spatial area, this implies that the reference to 'centre' in MCZ-P7.2.a was a drafting error. This was not picked up through submissions or analysis of the provisions in preparation of the [section 42A report](#). Nor was it addressed in the [recommendation report](#) provided by the IHP.

There are two options for addressing this issue, being:

- (i) To amend clause 2.a of MCZ-P7 to align with MCZ-O3 (amended through this plan change) by also referencing the surrounding residential areas, as shown below:
  - a. *Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the centre and surrounding residential areas;*

- (ii) To amend clause 2.a of MCZ-P7 (Quality development outcomes) to align with CCZ-P9, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 as follows:

- a. *Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the ~~centre~~-neighbourhood;*

Both of the above options will recognise that development in both the centres and the adjacent residential neighbourhoods is expected to intensify. However, option 2a(ii) is the preferred option because it will achieve consistency with CCZ-P9, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7. There is no logical reason to depart from the language used in the CCZ, LCZ and NCZ for this zone.

This amendment will change the way the clause is applied. It will change the scope of assessment against the clause in a resource consent assessment to include consideration of the built form and development outcomes enabled within the wider neighbourhood where intensification is also enabled by the Plan, rather than being focused on the centre zone itself.

The outcome expected by this change is increased recognition and policy support for intensified development from the status quo (where this is of a suitable quality), recognising the changes enabled in the wider neighbourhood. It will also avoid an overly restrictive and unfavourable policy assessment particularly for developments near or on boundaries between the MCZ and surrounding residential zones. An analysis of the costs and benefits of this change is provided below. I note that the same costs and benefits would apply to option 2a(i).

#### **Costs**

##### *Environmental*

- One environmental cost of changing the policy will be the potential impact on the residential amenity within the HRZ adjoining the two MCZ. The amendment recognises that the level of built development and amenity of the HRZ is also changing. This was the intent at the time of drafting of the provision, so as to give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD, but is not expressed accurately in the current wording.

##### *Economic*

- There are no economic costs other than those identified in the original section 32 report.

##### *Social and Cultural*

- There are no identified social or cultural costs other than those identified in the original section 32 report.

#### **Benefits**

##### *Environmental*

- The environmental benefit will be the realisation of development capacity enabled in the two MCZ, and resultant creation of well-functioning urban environments.
- The result will be centres and adjoining residential areas that are complementary in scale and achieve well-functioning urban environments.

##### *Economic*

- Clearly expressing that the scale of built development both in and around the two MCZ will increase removes the expectation that current residential levels of residential amenity will be retained. This will assist to remove a potential unintended barrier at the resource consent stage and reduce costs associated with the assessment of an application.

##### *Social and Cultural*

- Recognising that the scale of built development both in and around the two MCZ will remove a potential unintended barrier to the realisation of additional housing capacity, enabling people to live both in and around these centres.
- Requiring high quality design and amenity outcomes will benefit the occupants of both MCZ, and the adjoining residents who use the services that these centres provide.

### *Effectiveness and Efficiency*

The recommended change aligns with the direction, and supports the effective implementation of NPS-UD objective 1, assisting with the development of well-functioning urban environments. There is no clear reason why MCZ-P7.2.a differs from the equivalent CCZ, LCZ and NCZ clauses and the proposed amendment will improve consistency across the CMUZ chapters. This will assist Plan users with interpretation of the policy and assist to provide certainty as to how it is applied. Hence it is considered to be an effective and efficient way of addressing the issue.

#### **Option 2.b – Amend the hyperlink to ‘public space’ at clause 3.a.iv of the CCZ policy**

At present, the clause is as follows:

- iv. *A listed public space.*

The hyperlink (underlined) takes Plan users to the [definition](#) of ‘public space’. This is not manually added, but rather a function of the [ePlan](#). Therefore, it is not possible to resolve the issue by changing the hyperlink.

The intent of clause 3 is to require consideration of development on sites that have been recognised in the District Plan as having unique values. This includes:

- Signs and areas of significance to Māori (SCHED7)
- Heritage buildings, structures and areas (SCHED1, SCHED2, SCHED3)
- Character precincts (MCZ-PREC01, MCZ-PREC02, MCZ-PREC03)
- Residential and open space zones (MRZ, HRZ, OSZ)

In the CCZ, this also includes:

- The Waterfront Zone
- Listed public spaces.

The term ‘*A listed public space*’ is not intended to capture all public spaces as defined in the Plan, but rather those spaces set out at Appendix 9 (City Centre Zone and Special Purpose Waterfront Zone – Minimum Sunlight Access and Wind Comfort Control – Public Space Requirements). Additional building standards apply to development in and around the public spaces identified in the appendix.

Therefore, the hyperlink in the policy to the definition of ‘*public space*’ is not useful as it directs Plan users to the incorrect part of the ePlan. Retaining this hyperlink will result in broader application of the policy than was intended, and will prevent this from effectively regulating development adjacent to the protected public spaces.

It is also noted that all other references in the chapter are to ‘*identified*’, rather than ‘*listed*’ public spaces. This creates an inconsistency between the policy and other provisions (objectives, rules and standards).

To resolve this issue, the following amendment is recommended that CCZ-P9.3.a.iv is amended to refer to ‘*A public space identified in Appendix 9*’.

In the context of consideration of the policy as a whole, any environmental, economic, social or cultural costs associated with this change are expected to be negligible. There are limited environmental, social or cultural benefits; however, narrowing down the requirement so that it only applies to public spaces identified at Appendix 9 (and not all public spaces) may reduce costs associated with resource consent applications. Again, in the context of the policy as a whole, this benefit is expected to be negligible.

*Effectiveness and efficiency*

For the reasons detailed above, the proposed change to clause 3.a.iv of CCZ-P9 is an effective way to address the identified issue that will ensure that the clause is implemented as was originally intended in an efficient manner.

**Option 2.c - Correct punctuation and minor errors**

There are instances in the policies of missing semicolons and incorrectly located conjunctions between the clauses. Revisiting the policies through this plan change provides an opportunity to correct these errors.

Any such changes will not change how the respective policy clauses are implemented. There are no environmental, economic, social or cultural costs or benefits associated with the correction of the minor punctuation errors within the policies, which could also be amended by way of a clause 20A amendment prior to the notification of this plan change.

*Effectiveness and efficiency*

This change will correct small errors that have been identified and does not alter how any of the policies are implemented. It is an effective and efficient way of providing clarity for Plan users.

*Overall evaluation of Option 2*

The changes detailed above are considered to be minor in nature and do not change the intent of the policies, which is to ensure that development within the CMUZ result in quality development outcomes and, as development intensifies over time, well-functioning urban environments.

Overall, it is evident that amendments to CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 will assist with interpretation and implementation of these policies, thereby benefitting both developers and Council officers assessing resource consent applications.

**Risk of acting/not acting**

There is sufficient information to assess the risk of acting or not acting.

It is not intended that any specific clause of the Amenity and Design policies is applied in isolation, but rather that the clauses set a framework for a comprehensive assessment of any particular building design. Hence retaining the current versions of CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 is considered to be a low-risk option.

Nevertheless, to improve the implementation of the policies, ensure consistency across the suite of CMUZ chapters, and for an improved Plan user experience, a number of changes are recommended. These changes are considered to be minor in nature, with no associated risk.



### Overall evaluation of issue

Overall, given the recommended changes resolve the minor identified issues, there is more risk if these are not implemented than if they are. This being that the identified clauses will not be correctly or efficiently implemented by developers and/or Council officers, leading to unnecessary costs and delays at the resource consent application stage.

### Consultation

The recommended amendments at Option 2 have been discussed with members of the Resource Consents Team to ensure that these resolve the identified Plan implementation and consistency issues. Feedback has been provided confirming that the changes appropriately address the issue.

Due to the minor nature of the changes, no further consultation has been undertaken.

### Recommendation

Following the assessment above, Option 2 (To Amend CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7) is the recommended option. Tracked changes versions of the policies showing these changes are provided below.

As demonstrated in the assessment above, for the most part there are limited costs and benefits associated with the recommended changes. Nevertheless, the costs of not acting will be greater than the costs of amending the provisions as recommended, in particular with respect to lack of clarity as to how CCZ-P9, MCZ-P7, LCZ-P7 and NCZ-P7 should be applied.

### Recommended Changes

#### CCZ-P9 - Quality development outcomes

Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development, at a site scale to positively contribute to the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the City Centre Zone by:

1. Fulfilling the intent of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide;
2. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development:
  - a. Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood;
  - b. Optimises the development capacity of the land, including sites that are large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking areas;
  - c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation anticipated;
  - d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; and
  - e. Is accessible for emergency service vehicles;
3. Ensuring that development, where relevant:
  - a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to:
    - i. A scheduled site or area of significance to Māori;
    - ii. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area;
    - iii. An identified character precinct;
    - iv. A ~~listed~~ public space identified at Appendix 9;
    - v. Residential zones;
    - vi. Open space zones; and
    - vii. The Waterfront Zone;
  - b. Responds to the pedestrian scale of narrower streets;

- c. Responds to any identified significant natural hazard risks and climate change effects, including the strengthening and adaptive reuse of existing buildings;
  - d. Provides a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment;
  - e. Enhances the quality of the streetscape and the private/public interface;
  - f. Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport activity movement networks, including planned rapid transit stops;
  - g. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted to a range of activities, including residential along streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements; and
  - h. Positively contributes to the sense of place and distinctive form of the City Centre where the site or proposal will be prominent;-
4. Recognising the benefits of well-designed accessible, resilient and sustainable development, including the extent to which the development:
- a. Enables universal accessibility within buildings, ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/disability; ~~and~~
  - b. Incorporates a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change and earthquake resilience; and
  - c. Incorporates construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs.

#### MCZ-P7 - Quality development outcomes

Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Metropolitan Centre Zone by:

- 1. Fulfilling the intent of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide;
- 2. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive, development, including the extent to which the development:
  - a. Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood centre;
  - b. Optimises the development capacity of land, including sites that are large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking areas;
  - c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone;
  - d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; and
  - e. Is accessible for emergency service vehicles;
- 3. Ensuring that the development, where relevant:
  - a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to:
    - i. A scheduled site or area of significance to Māori;
    - ii. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area;
    - iii. Residential zoned areas; ~~and~~
    - iv. Open space zoned areas;
  - b. Provides a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment;
  - c. Enhances the quality of the streetscape and public / private interface;
  - d. Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport movement networks; ~~and~~
  - e. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted for a range of activities, including residential; ~~and~~
  - f. Positively contributes to the sense of place and distinctive form of the Metropolitan Centre where the site or proposal will be prominent;
- 4. Recognising the benefits of well-designed accessible, resilient and sustainable development, including the extent to which the development:
  - a. Enables universal accessibility within buildings, ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/disability; ~~and~~
  - b. Incorporates a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change and earthquake resilience; and
  - c. Incorporates construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs.

#### LCZ-P7 - Quality development outcomes

Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Local Centre Zone by:

1. Fulfilling the intent of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide;
2. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development:
  - a. Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood;
  - b. Optimises the development capacity of land;
  - c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone; and
  - d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities;
  - e. Is accessible for emergency service vehicles; ~~and~~
3. Ensuring that the development, where relevant:
  - a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to:
    - i. A scheduled site or area of significance to Māori;
    - ii. Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas;
    - iii. An identified character precinct;
    - iv. Residential zoned areas;
    - v. Open space zoned areas;
  - b. Provides a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment;
  - c. Enhances the quality of the streetscape and public / private interface;
  - d. Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport movement networks, including planned rapid transit stops; ~~and~~
  - e. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted for a range of activities, including residential; ~~and~~
  - f. Positively contributes to the sense of place and distinctive form of the Local Centre where the site or proposal will be prominent; ~~and~~
4. Recognising the benefits of well-designed accessible, resilient and sustainable development, including the extent to which the development:
  - a. Enables universal accessibility within buildings, ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/disability; ~~and~~
  - b. Incorporates a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change earthquake resilience; and
  - c. Incorporates construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs.

#### NCZ-P7 - Quality development outcomes

Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by:

1. Fulfilling the intent of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide; ~~and~~
2. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, including the extent to which the development:
  - a. Reflects the nature and scale of the development enabled within the zone and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood;
  - b. Optimises the development capacity of land; ~~and~~
  - c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation enabled in this zone; ~~and~~
  - d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; ~~and~~
  - e. Is accessible for emergency service vehicles; ~~and~~
3. Ensuring that the development, where relevant:
  - a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to:
    - i. A scheduled site or area of significance to Māori; ~~and~~
    - ii. Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas; ~~and~~
    - iii. An identified character precinct; ~~and~~
    - iv. Residential zoned areas; ~~and~~
    - v. Open space and recreation zoned areas;

- b. Provides a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment;
  - c. Enhances the quality of the streetscape and public / private interface;
  - d. Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport movement networks, including planned rapid transit stops; and
  - e. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted for a range of activities, including residential; ~~and~~
4. Recognising the benefits of well-designed accessible, resilient and sustainable development, including the extent to which the development:
- a. Enables universal accessibility within buildings, ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/disability; ~~and~~
  - b. Incorporates a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change and earthquake resilience; and
  - c. Incorporates construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs.

### **Consequential Amendments**

No consequential amendments are required.