

Attachment 2 – Panel Recommendations on Submissions and Further Submissions

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S1.1	Keith Bennett	Not stated	That Upper Hutt rate payers are rightfully involved in these fundamental district planning changes that will dramatically change Upper Hutt forever.	Reject	The Upper Hutt community has been consulted on draft plan change provisions and had the opportunity to take part in the formal IPI process. There are no further opportunities for involvement beyond the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process.	No
S2.1	Silvia Purdie	Entire IPI	Prioritise green spaces for every proposal for residential intensification.	Reject	It is unclear what amendments the submission seeks to make to the IPI. The IPI content is restricted to the matters that can be included under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
S2.2	Silvia Purdie	Entire IPI	Increase and protect native forest to create bird corridors and greater forest cover for the whole city.	Reject	It is unclear what amendments the submission seeks to make to the IPI. The IPI content is restricted to the matters that can be included under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
S2.3	Silvia Purdie	Entire IPI	Dedicate land for community gardens and urban farming.	Reject	It is unclear what amendments the submission seeks to make to the IPI. The IPI content is restricted to the matters that can be included under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
S2.4	Silvia Purdie	Entire IPI	Support community initiatives to develop gardens and food production in the city.	Reject	It is unclear what amendments the submission seeks to make to the IPI. The IPI content is restricted to the matters that can be included under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
S3.1	Hayley Downing	Not stated	To think of other people and not a flash in the pan rule change.	Reject	It is unclear what amendments the submission seeks to make to the IPI. The IPI content is restricted to the matters that can	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					be included under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA. The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	
S6.1	Darren Walton	Not stated	Please reinstate the Conservation Precinct in the small but significant areas in which they previously applied and give a proper account for the rules of Intensification Planning regarding the character, heritage, special status, and ecological significance of those areas.	Reject	No matters have been identified in the area that would justify the application of any additional qualifying matters pursuant to section 77I of the RMA.  The Council is in discussions with affected property owners regarding the potential identification and protection of areas of ecological significance across the City, however this work is separate to the IPI process.	No
S7.1	Jo Coffee	Not stated	More tree protection in Trentham. General residential zone at entrance to Upper Hutt on river side of Fergusson Drive not just orange on some map. Limit to height of high rises in main city. It is not Wellington city it is a small city.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.  Although the submitter's concerns are acknowledged, the heights and densities of urban form proposed by the IPI within residential zones are required to be enabled within the District Plan under section 77G of the RMA, unless a qualifying matter(s) apply. The IPI proposes to retain existing qualifying matters that are already included in the District Plan (such as natural hazard provisions), however no justification has been identified for the inclusion of additional qualifying matters to reduce the application of the MDRS and implementation of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	No
S9.1	Sarah Loveridge	Not stated	Oppose Intensification Planning Instrument.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S10.1	Jonathan Singh	Not stated	Reject this proposal.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S11.1	Russell Browning	Not stated	Include in scope of the planning instrument, regard for all aspects of population growth not just property, which includes all aspects of living.	Reject	It is unclear what decision the submission is seeking. No specific amendments to the IPI are requested.	No
S13.1	Murray Cope	Not stated	No to multi story dwellings in existing residential areas.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S15.1	Debbie Hawinkels	Entire IPI	To seek further public consultation as well as other urban planning ideas to retain Upper Hutt and its character - not just mass urban precincts.	Reject	<p>The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA. Timeframes for progressing the IPI are specified in sections 80F of the RMA and Part 4 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Public consultation has been carried out on draft provisions and on the notified IPI. There is no ability to carry out further public consultation and still meet the statutory timeframes for processing the IPI.</p>	No
S17.1	Adam Ricketts	Entire IPI	Resist and delay the government directives for as long as possible. The government is powerless without the councils. If all councils refused, the government would have to abort this lunacy.	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns regarding the resulting change in amenity values that may result from the IPI are noted, the Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA. Policy 6 of the NPS-UD makes it clear that significant changes to the amenity as a result of the changes enabled by the IPI are not in themselves an adverse effect. This significantly limits the Council's ability to have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values in residential areas that may be affected by the heights and densities of urban form enabled by the IPI.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S18.1	Teresa Homan	Entire IPI	I request either advocating a repeal of the RMA legislation to central government. Or an expanded district plan that takes into account the unnecessary concentration of intensified housing near rail.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.  Intensification of housing within a walkable catchment of rail stations is a requirement of Policy 3(c)(i) of the NPS-UD.	No
S21.1	Lorraine Pells	Entire IPI	Our local authority needs to better represent the rate payers and residents. There are areas of the country that will not slavishly allow the lives of the local residents to be damaged from unsuitable development and inappropriate development. I believe Christchurch is looking closely at this. I want our local representatives to look after our quality of life better and moderate this so that it enhances our lives and doesn't make living in the Valley a lowered compromise of quality and environment for all.	Reject	The submission point does not request any specific amendments to the IPI. The IPI is a mandatory plan change that the Council is required to progress within the timeframes specified by the NPS-UD and RMA.	No
S22.1	Stephen Bell	Entire IPI	Reject these changes, and develop an intensification profile more in keeping with our current character; ensuring effective managing of our water supply, stormwater, wastewater; controlling noise; providing adequate residential parking and maintaining the current character of existing Upper Hutt suburbs.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S23.1	Brad M (surname not supplied)	Entire IPI	Please don't let the already-rich NIMBY's ruin things for the rest of us.	Reject	It is unclear what decision is sought by this submission point.	No
S24.1	Graham Bellamy	Not stated	Lower limit on housing intensification i.e., 2 storey max on residential housing.	Reject	The Council is required to change the district plan to incorporate the Medium	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>Density Residential Standards into all relevant residential zones pursuant to section 77G of the RMA. The Council is also required to enable the building heights specified by policy 3 (a), (c), and (d) of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Council may reduce the application of the Medium Density Residential Standards or the building heights specified by the NPS-UD only to the degree necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter as provided for by section 77I of the RMA. Other than the existing qualifying matters included in the IPI, no other qualifying matters are proposed.</p>	
S25.1	Anthony and Kaye Swanson	Not stated	<p>Common sense and recognition of the current ratepayer's equity in their properties in addition to recognising the character of the area.</p> <p>Services, especially emergency would be compromised.</p>	Reject	<p>The Council is required to change the district plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards into all relevant residential zones pursuant to section 77G of the RMA. The Council is also required to enable the building heights specified by policy 3 (a), (c), and (d) of the NPS-UD and section 77I of the RMA.</p> <p>The Council may reduce the application of the Medium Density Residential Standards, or the building heights specified by the NPS-UD to the degree necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter as provided for by section 77I of the RMA. Other than the existing qualifying matters included in the IPI, no other qualifying matters are proposed.</p> <p>The provision of infrastructure to serve growth will need to be funded via financial contributions, development contributions</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					and rates. Planning for infrastructure investment is carried out via the Long Term Plan process under the Local Government Act 2002.	
S26.1	Marian and Dennis Cole	Entire IPI	We seek greater clarity in the document and the need to consult with neighbours and others immediately effected in all high density developments. It seems that we are excluded from doing so at present.	Reject	<p>The MDRS specifies the density standards for new buildings in residential zones. The MDRS also specifies how the district plan is to enable and provide for new residential subdivision - including the notification provisions. The IPI gives effect to these requirements. It is acknowledged that subdivision and development under the MDRS density standards and subdivision requirements could potentially result in adverse effects on existing residents (such as a loss of direct sunlight), however the Government has legislated that these provisions, including the limitations on notification, must be incorporated into the District Plan via the IPI.</p> <p>The IPI proposes to introduce hydraulic neutrality provisions to contribute towards the sustainable management of natural and physical resources (as provided for by section 80E(2)(f) of the RMA), however no additional sustainability provisions are proposed via the IPI due to the limitations on the matters that can be included in an IPI under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.</p>	No
S28.1	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	Entire IPI	Seeks that intensive residential development is not enabled adjacent to Rimutaka Prison.	Reject	The land on which the Rimutaka Prison is located is zoned Special Purpose Zone. As can be seen on the proposed IPI zoning maps, no land sharing a boundary with the Rimutaka Prison site is proposed to enable more intensive development.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					Rimutaka Prison is designated as a prison under designation reference number COR1. If the physical extent of the designation is considered to be insufficient for its designated purpose, it is noted the Minister for Corrections is empowered to give notice of a requirement to alter the designation under section 181 of the RMA. If additional land is necessary to guarantee the safe and secure operation of the prison, then the notice of requirement to acquire additional land is an option available to the Minister.	
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought as the operation and security should be adequately managed within the grounds of Rimutaka Prison itself. Being near a prison is not a qualifying matter.</p>	Accept	Submission point S28.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S30.1	Kim Gutchlag and Patrick Waddington	Entire IPI	<p>Every application to build dwellings of more than two storeys must be carefully scrutinised by the Council and permitted only where certain standard criteria can be met.</p> <p>Its Intensification Planning Instrument has clearly had regard for some of these, but perhaps not all.</p> <p>For any proposed new housing block of three storeys or more to be acceptable anywhere in the city, it must be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>its likely effect on the natural environment including birdlife will</li> </ol>	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA. This includes enabling three residential units on a residential zoned site of up to three stories in height as a permitted activity. The Council is able to reduce the applicability of the MDRS density standards and the building height requirements within walkable catchments as required by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD only to the degree necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter under section 77I of the RMA. The Council proposes only to retain the existing qualifying matters in residential zones currently in the District Plan as provided for by section 77K of the RMA.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>be mitigated by obligatory planting of appropriate trees and shrubs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. the extent of concrete surfaces around it must be kept to a minimum, to reduce the likelihood of flooding of neighbouring properties, to provide space for planting of trees and shrubs, and to retain some unsurfaced land available for waste disposal following an earthquake or other natural disaster.</li> <li>3. it must be sited far enough away from existing houses not to impair their inhabitants' privacy, free movement, and quality of life.</li> <li>4. it must not obstruct sunlight from surrounding properties.</li> <li>5. it must not destroy the pleasant outlook of surrounding properties for which these were located where they are.</li> <li>6. it must not create wind tunnels for surrounding properties.</li> <li>7. it must have adequate provision for tenants' off-street vehicle parking, whether underground or not, so that roadways are not clogged up with cars and in some cases perhaps even made impassable.</li> <li>8. the approach to it by ambulances, delivery vans, service vehicles,</li> </ol>		<p>With respect to the specific decisions requested by the submitter, the following responses are provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obligatory landscaping standards are included as one of the mandatory MDRS density standards.</li> <li>2. Building coverage is limited to 50% of the net site area via the mandatory MDRS standard. In addition, the IPI proposes to introduce a new requirement for hydraulic neutrality to ensure stormwater does not leave a site faster than the pre-development state.</li> <li>3. Setbacks are managed via the mandatory MDRS setback standard.</li> <li>4. Sunlight access is managed via the mandatory MDRS standard for height in relation to boundary. It is acknowledged this standard is likely to result in the loss of sunlight to surrounding properties in some scenarios.</li> <li>5. Amenity values such as a pleasant outlook from residential sites cannot be maintained via the District Plan due to the direction of Policy 6(b) that notes the planned urban built form enabled by the district plan may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values for others. This policy also makes it clear that these effects are not, of themselves, and adverse effect.</li> </ol>	



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>tradespeople and rubbish collectors must be safe and unimpeded.</p> <p>9. it must have adequate, safely fenced play areas for resident families with children.</p> <p>10. its pedestrian access and entrances must be safe and unobstructed, including for prams and wheelchairs.</p> <p>11. the building materials used, including for its cladding, must be of prime quality and resistant to fire and water damage.</p> <p>12. assurance must be given that any internal corridors, stairs, lifts, doors, windows and balconies will be safe, reliable and fireproof.</p> <p>13. the proposed building must be aesthetically pleasing and aspire to improve rather than detract from the existing environment; and</p> <p>14. the consequential costs of any kind determined by the Council to be necessary such as those due to new drains, safety walls and fences, realigned public pavements, traffic lights or roundabouts in the general area of the dwellings or groups of dwellings must be met by developers not by Upper Hutt ratepayers at large.</p>		<p>6. Wind tunnels is not a matter currently managed by the District Plan. It is not intended to manage wind tunnels via a new qualifying matter as no evidence base currently exists to manage this potential effect.</p> <p>7. Off-street cannot be required in the District Plan as a result of NPS-UD Policy 11, and Clause 3.38 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>8. Access requirements are managed via minimum engineering standards and requirements under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</p> <p>9. Fencing is not a requirement under the district plan.</p> <p>10. Access requirements are managed via the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</p> <p>11. Building materials and cladding is not managed via the District Plan.</p> <p>12. These matters fall under the Building Act 2004 and the Building Code.</p> <p>13. Building aesthetics are managed to a small degree via the proposed design guides – however these guides are intended only to manage the design of buildings for the purposes of encouraging development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces, including for providing passive surveillance as a component of a well-functioning urban environment.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					14. Financial contributions are proposed to assist the Council to source funding from developers to fund the necessary new and upgraded infrastructure.	
S31.1	Julie Cowan	Entire IPI	These new rules need to be carefully reviewed for the sake of Upper Hutt and the Environment! My decision would be to oppose (housing of at least 6 storeys within walking distance of trains and the CBD, three storeys in residential zones, no maximum height in city centre and developers to pay for infrastructure). More restrictions and resource consents should be required to protect our people and especially our environment!	Reject	The Council is required to progress the IPI under sections 77G, 80E, and 80G of the RMA.  The Council is required by NPS-UD Policy 3 to enable heights of at least 6 stories within walkable catchments of the City Centre Zone and Rapid Transit Stops.	No
S32.1	Z Energy Limited	Entire IPI	<p>a) Achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i The purpose and principles of the RMA consistency with the relevant provisions in Sections 6 - 8;</li> <li>ii Give effect to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement;</li> <li>iii Assist the Council to carry out its functions under Section 31 of the RMA;</li> <li>iv Meet the requirements of the statutory tests in section 32 of the RMA; and</li> <li>v Avoid, remedy, or mitigate any relevant and identified environmental effects.</li> </ul> <p>b) Make any alternative or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission, including, to the degree there is</p>	Accept in part	<p>The IPI:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Achieves the purpose and principles of the RMA and is consistent with Sections 6-8.</li> <li>2. Gives effect to the RPS subject to Sections 77G(8), 80E, and 80G of the RMA.</li> <li>3. Will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under Section 31 of the RMA.</li> <li>4. Meets the requirements of Section 32 of the RMA.</li> <li>5. Avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment within the constraints of Sections 77G, and 77Q of the RMA.</li> <li>6. May provide alternative or consequential relief where there is scope to do so under the</li> </ol>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>scope, any consequential relief required in any other sections of the Upper Hutt City District Plan (“the District Plan”) and/or the IPI that are not specifically subject of this submission but where consequential changes are required to ensure a consistent approach is taken throughout the documents; and</p> <p>c) c) Any other relief required to give effect to the issues raised in this submission.</p>		<p>constraints specified by Sections 77M, 80E and 80G of the RMA.</p> <p>Alternative or consequential relief, or other relief may not be provided to address the matters raised in the submission. See specific submission points for details.</p>	
S33.1	Fuel Companies	Entire IPI	<p>i Achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i The purpose and principles of the RMA consistency with the relevant provisions in Sections 6 - 8;</li> <li>ii Give effect to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement;</li> <li>iii Assist the Council to carry out its functions under Section 31 of the RMA;</li> <li>iv Meet the requirements of the statutory tests in section 32 of the RMA; and</li> <li>v Avoid, remedy or mitigate any relevant and identified environmental effects.</li> </ul> <p>ii Make any alternative or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission, including, to the degree there is scope, any consequential relief required in any other sections of the Upper Hutt City District Plan (“the</p>	Accept in part	<p>The IPI:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Achieves the purpose and principles of the RMA and is consistent with Sections 6-8.</li> <li>2. Gives effect to the RPS subject to Sections 77G(8), 80E, and 80G of the RMA.</li> <li>3. Will assist the Council in carrying out its functions under Section 31 of the RMA.</li> <li>4. Meets the requirements of Section 32 of the RMA.</li> <li>5. Avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment within the constraints of Sections 77G, and 77Q of the RMA.</li> </ol> <p>May provide alternative or consequential relief where there is scope to do so under the constraints specified by Sections 77M, 80E and 80G of the RMA.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			District Plan”) and/or the IPI that are not specifically subject of this submission but where consequential changes are required to ensure a consistent approach is taken throughout the documents; and c) Any other relief required to give effect to the issues raised in this submission.			
S34.1	Mary Beth Taylor	Entire IPI	Add additional and stronger environmental protections and enhancements in the Plan Change, research limits to growth for Upper Hutt, move ahead to enable urban intensification particularly along the existing main transport corridors.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the IPI under sections 77G, 80E, and 80G of the RMA.  It is noted that additional environmental enhancements, such as the identification and protection of additional significant natural areas can be achieved via future plan changes supported by an evidence base.  In addition, the Council is progressing its responsibilities to prepare a Future Development Strategy to direct future growth within the City as required by Subpart 4 of the NPS-UD.	No
S34.4	Mary Beth Taylor	Not stated (assumed to be MDRS Landscaping standard)	Landscaping to include at least 50% indigenous vegetation.	Reject	Landscaping provisions are included in the IPI in accordance with the MDRS. No additional landscaping provisions can be included.	No
S36.1	Summerset Group Holdings	Entire IPI	Summerset supports the inclusion of changes that are provided by the MDRS provision of the Enabling Housing Supply Act. Summerset requests the Council engages constructively with the	Reject	The submitter's support for the MDRS is acknowledged, however the submission does not seek any specific decisions on the IPI. The process of the IPI in terms of engagement between the Council and submitters must be carried out in	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's IPI.		accordance with the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process as set out in Part 6 of Schedule 1 of the RMA.	
S38.1	Rowena Simpkins	Entire IPI	I want this blanket housing intensification opposed.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S39.1	Design Network Architecture Limited	Entire IPI	We are seeking clarification of these standards, as per the attached document (see submission for details).	Reject	<p>The submitter requests clarification of the MDRS standard for Windows to Street, specifically the meaning of 'street-facing façade'. It is agreed the standard lacks clarity, however it is a mandatory MDRS standard that the Council does not have the discretion to amend.</p> <p>Regarding the exclusion for existing or proposed internal boundaries for the height in relation to boundary standard, it is noted the exclusion list from the MDRS has not been included in HRZ-S3 in error. It is recommended the MDRS exclusion list for boundaries with a road, existing or proposed internal boundaries, and common walls in inserted into HRZ-S3 in accordance with the MDRS density standards.</p> <p>As this submission point does not seek any specific decisions on the IPI it is recommended for rejection.</p>	Yes
S42.1	Jaap Knechtmans	Entire IPI	To meet with Upper Hutt residents and the relevant Central Government officials in person (particularly those within the high density boundaries identified) and dialogue with them to discuss the associated issues, risks and opportunities.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S44.1	Jonathan Board	Not stated	Remove the Southern Growth Area from consideration.	Reject	The removal of areas identified for future growth planning is not within the scope of the IPI.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS16 – Stephen Pattinson			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Agree with submitter's reasons.	Reject	Submission point S44.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S45.1	Beatrice Serrao	High Density Residential Zone	<p>Unsure what you mean by this. I feel that those forms are purposely so hard to interpret and understand.</p> <p>No at a such large high density area!!!!  No Upper Hutt will turn into a Bronx.  The high density area is excessively large. 6 storeys high buildings are going to be such an eye sore. Build your skyscrapers near the city centre!</p>	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S47.1	Julie Cameron	High Density Residential Zone	I seek that any new building of high density only be allowed within the city centre (Main St area) of Upper Hutt, not within family suburbs. No existing families should be "cramped" within their own home with sunlight affected, leading to unhealthy homes, leading to many leaving Upper Hutt. Don't let the proposed plan change affect the clean, green, Upper Hutt that families chose for more space, sun, and the suburbs.	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns are noted, the Council is required to progress the IPI to change the District Plan to incorporate the MDRS into the residential zone provisions and give effect to the building heights and density of urban form requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. No general qualifying matters are identified or proposed to provide the changes requested by the submitter.	No
S51.4	Ministry of Education	GRZ-R19	Rule GRZ–R19 Places of assembly (including places of worship, educational facilities) are by default Discretionary activities.	Reject	Rule GRZ-R19 specifically manages places of assembly. This rule does not form part of the IPI as it does not require any amendments to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to the requirements of Policies 3 and 4 of the NPS-UD. The requested relief is not within the scope of the IPI.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S52.9	Oyster Management Limited	Entire IPI	In addition to the specific relief sought, Oyster seeks such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.	Reject	It is unclear what additional or consequential relief is sought to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	No
S55.1	Duncan Stuart	Southern Growth Area	Remove the Southern Growth Area from future growth planning.	Reject	The removal of areas identified for future growth planning is not within the scope of the IPI.	No
S58.34	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NH-R7	Amend NH-R7 to replace reference to 'residential accommodation' with 'residential activities'.	Reject	Need to check for unintended consequences and scope.	No
S58.35	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NH-S6	Remove NH-S6 from a Restricted Discretionary Activity and include as a standard for a Permitted Activity.'	Reject	Changes to natural hazard provisions would be best conducted via a comprehensive non-IPI plan change process to enable the full preparation and testing of the evidence base, and to enable the full participation of the community, directly affected property owners, mana whenua, and all other interested stakeholders. Attempting to include new natural hazard provisions via a submission on the IPI does not provide for these processes	No
S58.36	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NH-S7	Remove NH-S7 from a Restricted Discretionary Activity and include as a standard for a Permitted Activity.'	Reject	Changes to natural hazard provisions would be best conducted via a comprehensive non-IPI plan change process to enable the full preparation and testing of the evidence base, and to enable the full participation of the community, directly affected property owners, mana whenua, and all other interested stakeholders. Attempting to include new natural hazard provisions via a submission on the IPI does not provide for these processes.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S59.1	Kevin von Keisenberg	Entire IPI	More consultation and information are required.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.  Consultation on draft provisions has been carried out prior to the notification of the IPI. The Council has also provided additional information via 'frequently asked questions' on it's website. The Intensification Streamlined Planning Process does not provide an opportunity for additional consultation on the IPI.	No
S60.1	John A Sutton	Entire IPI	Adopt the same, sensible level of courage and democratic resolve displayed by the Christchurch City Council's Mayor and Councillors and join them in formally objecting to the imposition of the NPS-UD levels of intensification and convey this to the Minister for the Environment.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S60.2	John A Sutton	Entire IPI	Tell the Minister for the Environment that the unplanned wholesale haphazard intensification of Upper Hutt under the NPS-UD will destroy Upper Hutt's current well-functioning urban environment, not create one as is required under NPS-UD and that this level of intensification gives no weight whatsoever to liveability or amenity and is unacceptable to Upper Hutt City Council.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S60.3	John A Sutton	Entire IPI	Be prepared to risk being bullied by a government that uses the instrument of the NPS-UD to shackle you into haphazard and socially unacceptable levels of residential intensity, that are simply not necessary for Upper Hutt.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S60.4	John A Sutton	Entire IPI	Develop an Intensification Plan to submit to government (and residents!) that is not driven by flawed population growth projections, nor driven by haphazard intensification, nor driven by the lunacy of the current NPS-UD, but that respects the current levels of amenity, privacy, sunlight, and green space enjoyed in Upper Hutt while at the same time allowing for carefully planned and reasonable intensification of residential land use up to a maximum of 3 storeys provided any intensification includes mandatory off street car parking for each residential unit and with boundary height restrictions that are sensibly restrictive rather than the unacceptable proposed level of permissiveness.	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns on the potential impacts of the IPI are noted, the Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S61.1	Pru Keisenberg	Not stated	Cease the development of the Pinehaven Hills (Guilford). The potential for flooding and erosion is vast. The infrastructure cannot support this development.	Reject	The decision requested is not within the scope of the IPI. It is noted natural hazard provisions for subdivision, use and development are managed via the existing natural hazard provisions. The IPI does not propose any changes to these existing qualifying matters provisions.	No
S64.13	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	SIGN-R3 and SIGN-S2	Amend SIGN-R3 and SIGN-S2 and other related standards to provide for two signs of up to 3m2 per site as a permitted activity for retirement villages.	Reject	The requested amendments fall beyond the matters that can be included within an IPI under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
S64.140	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:	Reject	No specific amendments are requested by this submission point.  Amendments are recommended to the IPI in response to some submission points by	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relief sought in relation to specific provisions to make sure that they are workable for retirement villages including:</li> <li>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ul>		Submitter S64. Please see the other Submitter S64 submission points for specific recommendations.	
S65.3	Stephen Pattinson (late submission)	Entire IPI	Reverse Council's support for the Southern Growth Area (Guildford) and do not intensively develop the Silverstream and Pinehaven hills or make them "urban". Rather, preserve and protect the Silverstream and Pinehaven greenbelt hills in the Southern Hills Overlay to protect the high visual, ecological and landscape values of these hills.	Reject	The decision requested is not within the scope of the IPI.  It is noted natural hazard provisions for subdivision, use and development are managed via the existing natural hazard provisions. The IPI does not propose any changes to these existing qualifying matters provisions.	No
S66.1	Janice Carey	Entire IPI	No shadowing of homes. Please make sure you choose wisely. There are many obvious suitable locations to build high buildings, CBD, near railway lines, spaces next to green areas, river area, industrial areas. Very high buildings could be built along the base on the eastern hills from Rifle Range, north past CBD and further casting no shadows on homes. Keep us warm and healthy, not depressed.	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns on the potential impacts of the IPI are noted, the Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S67.1	Anthony Carey	Entire IPI	The council revisit the proposed IPI and reject any high residential building if they encroach and shadow other properties where people live. Provision to be made that buildings must have off-street parking as an example, the complex in Lower Hutt, High Street at	Reject	The submitter's concerns are noted; however, the Council is required by Section 77G of the RMA to progress the IPI to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policies 3 and 4 of the NPS-UD.  The Council is not able to require a minimum number of car parks be provided	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Taita has shown with angle parking out on road, would be impossible on the likes of Fergusson Drive, etc.		via the District Plan due to the prohibition on such provisions under Clause 3.38 of the NPS-UD.	
SUPPORTED BY: FS11 – Anthony Carey			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Fergusson Drive is the main gateway to Upper Hutt and needs to be preserved. The many trees and properties welcome people to the area.	Reject	Submission point S67.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S68.1	Louise Cleghorn	Entire IPI	Retain current regulations to ensure no houses affect each other's light.	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns on the potential impacts of the IPI are noted, the Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S68.2	Louise Cleghorn	Entire IPI	Seek higher provision for road repairs.	Reject	The repair of roads in itself is not a district plan matter.	No
S68.3	Louise Cleghorn	Entire IPI	Seek that no subdivision is below 350sqm per section unless this in in the CBD.	Reject	Schedule 3A, Clause 8 prevents the Council from specifying minimum lot sizes unless vacant allotments are proposed.	No
S68.4	Louise Cleghorn	Entire IPI	Seek provision for local medical centres, housing provided for doctors as needed and centres made available. Appropriate provision for other infrastructure e.g. shops / schools / additional visitor parking / roading.	Reject	It is considered the submission point does not seek any specific amendments to the IPI, but seeks a general approach for proving for housing, services, infrastructure, and goods and services.  The IPI proposes the creation of a centres hierarchy to enable the Council to give effect to the height and density of urban form requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, and to assist in the maintenance and creation of well-functioning urban environments. As part of this, provision is made for healthcare activities, housing, educational facilities, commercial and retail activities.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					Decisions on the provision of additional visitor parking and roading are generally not made under the RMA, but are funding and asset management decisions made by the Council via the Long Term Plan under the Local Government Act 2002.	
S72.20	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	Entire IPI	Whole Plan - Include more in depth provisions for climate resilience and adaptation to climate change.	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns with the lack of these provisions are noted, the requested relief is too broad to make specific recommendation on potential amendments – assuming any such amendments fit within the scope of the matters that can be included in an IPI under Sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington agrees that urban development and intensification should contribute to improving climate resilience.	Reject	Submission point S72.20 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
72.23	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	Renewable Energy Generation chapter	Renewable Energy Generation Whole Chapter - Inclusion of an objective or policy for renewable energy generation to enable mitigation and adaption to climate change.	Reject	The requested amendments are not considered to support, or be consequential on the MDRS or Policy 3 and 4 or the NPS-UD.  It is considered the requested inclusion of a specific objective or policy for renewable energy generation does not fit within the limits of what can be included in an IPI under Sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No
S72.31	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	Entire IPI	We are concerned that the urgency of giving effect to the IPI create unintended consequences which is not necessarily backed by evidence and analysis; this will be exacerbated by the fact that the	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns on the evidence base and assessment of the impacts of the IPI are noted, the Council is required to progress the IPI in accordance with Section 77G of the RMA.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			fast-track process will remove further appeal rights. Our experience evaluating these changes in the District Plans showed that the NPS-UD requirements did not pass rigorous analytical tests and critical thinking. They lack serious assessment of regulatory impacts.			
S72.32	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	Entire IPI	<i>'Further pre-notification requirements concerning iwi authorities'</i> requires that iwi and Mana Whenua are given reasonable, adequate time, and opportunity to comment, consider the draft proposals and are able to give advice on the Plan Change Variations. The speed in which Council is forced to undertake IPI changes in order to comply with central government deadlines means that iwi have not been provided with reasonable and adequate time required by the legislation.	Reject	It is agreed the timeframes specified for the IPI have been challenging for iwi authorities and the Council. Iwi authorities were provided with the draft IPI for comment prior to notification. However, the Council has a duty to meet the statutory timeframes specified by the Government in the RMA and the NPS-UD – which was notification of the IPI by 20 August 2022.	No
S73.1	Jacqui Hargreaves	Entire IPI	We should be standing up to the government and say no this is not happening.	Reject	The Council is required to progress the plan change under section 77G of the RMA.	No
S27.1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire IPI	Revise the corridor provisions to reflect Transpower's current, nationally consistent, engineering based approach to managing effects on the National Grid and giving effect to the NPSET.	Reject	The provisions that manage actual and potential effects on, and from the national grid are already incorporated into the District Plan within the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport chapter. These provisions are proposed to be retained as an existing qualifying matter to ensure their continued effect. If refinements to these provisions are desired by Transpower it is considered this should be progressed via a separate plan change in consultation with affected property owners. It is not	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					considered appropriate to review the electricity transmission corridor provisions via a submission on the IPI.	
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes such changes being undertaken within the IPI process.	Accept	It is recommended this further submission be accepted.	N/A
S27.2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire IPI	Seek amendments to the IPI to ensure that the provisions do not compromise the National Grid.	Accept in part	It is considered the existing electricity transmission provisions prepared to give effect to the NPS-ET ensure that subdivision, use and development will not compromise the National Grid. These provisions are proposed for retention via identifying them as an existing qualifying matter. However, amendments are recommended to provisions to improve clarity with respect to the applicability of qualifying matter areas as sought via other Transpower submission points.	No
S27.4	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire IPI	Retain or amend the provisions of the Proposed Plan Change to give effect to the NPSET and RPS, and achieve the purpose of the RMA as set out in Appendix C (detailed submission points) including such further alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.	Accept in part	In 2012 the Council changed the District Plan to give effect to the NPS-ET via Plan Change 32. This plan change was made operative on 26 October 2012.  The plan change implemented Transpower's Corridor Management Policy, and was prepared in consultation with Transpower using the guidance published by the Ministry for the Environment.  Council records for Plan Change 32 show all decisions requested by Transpower (other than those that requested the addition of advice notes regarding the Electricity	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>(Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003) were accepted by the Council.</p> <p>On 18 July 2012 Transpower formally advised the Council that:</p> <p><i>Transpower supports the proposed amendments to the District Plan and the recommended responses to our submission that were attached to the email. On this basis we hereby withdraw our request to be heard in support of our submission.</i></p> <p>As no amendments have been made to the Plan Change 32 provisions since they were made operative, and no amendments have been made to the NPS-ET since it came into force in 2008, it is considered the District Plan still gives effect to the NPS-ET.</p> <p>If it is desired by Transpower to update the provisions of the District Plan that give effect to the NPS-ET to reflect Transpower's preferred approach to electricity corridor management, this should be carried out via a plan change process that ensures all affected property owners are consulted with.</p> <p>Minor amendments are recommended to provisions to improve clarity with respect to the applicability of qualifying matter areas as sought via other Transpower submission points.</p>	
S33.7	Fuel Companies	Entire IPI	Seek amendments to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on existing	Accept in part	The submission point seeks general rather than specific amendments. This makes	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			lawfully established non-residential activities are minimised.		<p>recommending accepting the submission point difficult.</p> <p>All restricted discretionary rules for residential units within the centres zones and the Mixed Use Zone include reverse sensitivity effects on the continued operation of non-residential activities as a matter of discretion.</p> <p>Noise and ventilation provisions are included for all residential units within the centres and mixed use zone, thus mitigating the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>It is noted that reverse sensitive provisions are recommended to be added to relevant matters of discretion within the residential zones in response to other submissions, and these amendments may address the submitter's concerns.</p>	
OPPOSED BY FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.</p>	Reject	This further submission point appears to have been erroneously assigned to S33.7 by the further submitter.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to / within residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself,</p>	Accept	Submission S33.7 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised, and that directions provided so that effects can be avoided as far as practicable.	Accept in part	See reasons for submission S33.7.	Yes
S33.8	Fuel Companies	Entire IPI	Add new policy: <u>New residential development should be designed to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	It is not necessary to add a specific reverse sensitivity policy to the IPI, however other amendments are recommended to add <i>reverse sensitivity effects</i> to the matters of discretion to other specific rules.	No
	OPPOSED BY FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.	Accept	Submission point S33.8 is recommended for rejection.	NA
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to / within residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.	Accept	Submission point S33.8 is recommended for rejection.	NA

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised, and that directions provided so that effects can be avoided as far as practicable.	Reject	Submission point S33.8 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S37.1	Kimberley Vermaey	Entire IPI	Seek amendments including: (a) The threshold should be reduced to 4 residential units in HDZ instead of 6; (b) rules be worded to only require hydraulic neutrality for buildings containing residential units that are connected into the council mains via either a lateral or kerb to channel connection. It should not apply to soak pit designs ( <b>NOTE:</b> this submission point is addressed under the Hydraulic Neutrality section); (c) new Matters of Discretion when a development does not comply with the standards are just a replication of one another and are not specific to the non-compliance, amend to be specific; (d) 60% site coverage for HRZZ would be more appropriate than 70%; (e) include fence standards, it is suggested that a maximum fence height of 1.8m on the side boundary and 1.5m on the front boundary would be appropriate;	Reject	It is recommended this submission point be rejected for the following reasons: (a) Although reducing the threshold to four residential units within the High Density Residential Zone is an option, it is considered that setting the permitted standards at six residential units would encourage greater uptake of high density residential development opportunities. (b) Note the hydraulic neutrality submission point is addressed within the Hydraulic Neutrality section of this table. (c) The matters of discretion are considered appropriate for the consideration of the effects and matters under each rule. Note that most permitted activity standards are also accompanied by their own set of matters of discretion that are specific to each standard. (d) The site coverage of 70% within the High Density Residential Zone is considered appropriate for high density residential developments – noting that hydraulic neutrality and outdoor space per residential unit requirements also apply.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(f) GRZ-Precinct 1 Matters of Discretion do not mention vegetation protection. Amend to either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make the protection of indigenous vegetation as a matter of discretion for all residential development that exceeds the maximum number of permitted residential units and site coverage non-compliances. This would have the benefit of applying to all sites in the urban areas and allows for the protection of significant vegetation that may be on site and will align with the proposed RPS-direction; or</li> <li>2. Have a rule framework that requires introduces a vegetation protection consideration matter for new buildings in the Precinct area, when a building does not comply with the permitted activity standard.</li> </ol> <p>(g) g) There needs to be an objective, policy and rule framework to address the wind effects from new buildings over 12m in height.</p> <p>(h) h) any consequential changes needed to the District Plan to ensure that the submission points are achieved.</p>		<p>(e) The District Plan provides for fences via the minor structure provisions, which includes a fence or wall with a height of less than 2.0 metres. There is no evidence to suggest the existing fence height to be resulting in any implementation issues or adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>(f) The GRZ-Precinct 1 does not introduce any new vegetation protection rules – therefore there are no new matters of discretion included regarding vegetation protection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The protection of indigenous vegetation is managed under chapter ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity. The IPI only proposes to make consequential amendments to this chapter. The protection of additional vegetation not already identified and included in the District Plan will need to be carried out via a future RMA Schedule 1 plan change.</li> <li>2. The IPI does not propose a rule framework within the Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct. The protection of vegetation within the Precinct will be achieved via a future Schedule 1 RMA plan change process.</li> </ol> <p>(g) Regarding wind effects, although this could be a legitimate potential adverse effect from high buildings, addressing it in the District Plan via objectives, policies and rules would require an</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					evidence base to justify it, and the creation of a new qualifying matter. (h) No amendments or consequential amendments are recommended in response to the points raised.	
S41.1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	That the IPI aligns with the direction and intent of regulatory policies that apply to district plans where necessary.	Accept in part	As detailed in the section 32 evaluation report the IPI has been prepared to align with the direction and intent of all relevant regulatory policies that apply to district plans where they fit within the requirements of the scope of an IPI pursuant to sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.  In addition, as discussed in the report and within this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 in accordance with section 74(2) of the RMA, noting the Council is not required to <i>give effect</i> to a proposed change to a RPS.	No
S41.2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Include objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that implement the recommendations directed at territorial authorities in the Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao.	Accept in part	As detailed in the section 32 evaluation the IPI includes hydraulic neutrality provisions in as authorised by section 80E(2)(f) of the RMA that enables the IPI to include related provisions that manage stormwater including hydraulic neutrality. This is a matter identified in T e Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao.  Giving effect to relevant provisions of Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara Implementation Programme and Te Mahere Wai o Te Kāhui Taiao via the District Plan will take place via a future non-IPI plan change process and following the RPS giving effect to it.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS16 - Stephen Pattinson			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>By their own admission Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara did not give much consideration to stormwater and flood management with respect to the effects of intensification on the Pinehaven hills, and so implementation of their Recommendations in this respect are not reliable and must be treated with caution. It is not correct to assert, as GWRC does, that the Whaitua's recommendations on this issue are "community-endorsed" because the Whaitua did not give due regard to relevant evidence submitted to it on this issue.</p>	Accept in part	Hydraulic neutrality provisions are proposed in the IPI, however all other Te Whaitua te Whanganui-a-Tara recommendations are not recommended for inclusion in the IPI as they would not be authorised for inclusion in the IPI pursuant to Sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	N/A
S41.3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Include objectives, policies, and methods (including rules) to give effect to RPS Objective 12, NPS-FM section 3.5(4), have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3 and implement Te Mahere Wai and the Te Whanganui a Tara Whaitua Implementation Programme.</p>	Reject	<p>The submission point is recommended to be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As required by Section 74(2)(a), as discussed in the report and in this table, the Council has <i>had regard to</i> Proposed RPS Change 1. The Council notes there is no requirement to <i>give effect</i> to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</li> <li>2. Proposed RPS Change 1, including the provisions the submitter requests the IPI gives effect to (Objective 12 and FW.3), are subject to many submissions including a submission from Upper Hutt City Council. The Council's submission raises many concerns with these proposed RPS provisions. A hearing is yet to be held,</li> </ol>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>and it is unknown what the final form of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	
S41.4	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <p>(a) Include a strategic direction objective and/or policies to provide direction regarding ki uta ki tai, partnering with mana whenua, upholding Māori data sovereignty, and making decision with the best available information including Mātauranga Māori.</p> <p>(b) Include a strategic direction objective and / or policy to require regard is had to equity and inclusiveness issues in decision making.</p>	Reject	<p>The requested relief in this submission point requests the IPI gives effect to Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions - including Policy IM.1 and IM.2. 1.</p> <p>As required by Section 74(2)(a) the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 as discussed in the report and in this table. The Council notes there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>Proposed RPS Change 1, including the provisions the submitter requests the IPI gives effect to, are subject to many submissions including a submission from Upper Hutt City Council. The Council's submission raises a number of concerns with these proposed RPS provisions. A hearing is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS3 – Bob Anker			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>It is not appropriate for GWRC to include policy and regulation that is worded in such a way that it requires subjective interpretation. The phrase “socially and culturally appropriate” begs the question “by whose standards”. It is not the place of GWRC to be a self-appointed arbiter of social and cultural standards</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.4 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.5	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <p>(a) Include a strategic level objective and policy that recognises mana whenua / tangata whenua and their ability to exercise rangatiratanga / kaitiakitanga and their relationship to their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu and taonga (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(c)).</p> <p>(b) A policy to recognise, protect and enhance the Māori freshwater values. Amendments to matters of control or discretion where required to enable considerations of the policy.</p> <p>(c) In relevant policies and rules, for example indigenous vegetation clearance and earthworks, include as a matter of control or discretion, the adverse effects on mahinga kai, other customary uses and access for these activities (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(b)).</p>	Reject	<p>The submission point is recommended for rejection for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As required by Section 74(2)(a) the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 as discussed in the report and within this table. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</li> <li>Proposed RPS Change 1, including the provisions the submitter requests the IPI gives effect to, are subject to many submissions. Some of the relevant RPS Change 1 provisions are subject to a submission by Upper Hutt City Council that seeks changes to Policy FW.3, and raises concerns regarding legislative overreach, a proposed transfer of RMA section 30 powers to territorial local authorities for freshwater management, and being overly prescriptive in its use of verbs. A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final</li> </ol>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(d) Include a strategic objective and supporting policies to achieve management of the natural resources of the district or city in an integrated manner, recognising ki uta ki kai and the interrelationships between land, freshwater, the coast (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(e)).</p> <p>(e) Amend or include new controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules and include appropriate policy direction to manage any actual or potential effects of land use, development or subdivision and the effects of surface water activities on water quality (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(e)).</p> <p>(f) Include a policy that requires the use, development, and subdivision of land to consider effects on the harbour, rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs and riparian margins, including any relevant water quality attribute targets in a regional plan, ecosystem values and drinking water sources (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(h), (k), (l), (p) and (q)).</p> <p>(g) Include a policy and amend relevant rules to include triggers for consent and matters of control or discretion which require the application of water sensitive urban design principles, including sustainable stormwater design to minimise impacts on the natural environment</p>		<p>form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p> <p>3. It is not considered appropriate to request the IPI to include proposed RPS provisions that are subject to a submission from Upper Hutt City Council that raises concerns and seeks amendments.</p> <p>4. Some of the requested amendments are considered to go beyond the matters that can be included in an IPI under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA as they are not related provisions that support or are consequential on the MDRS provisions set out in Schedule 3A of the RMA. Examples include provisions to control roofing materials for water quality purposes, and rules that manage activities within riparian areas. It is considered they cannot be considered to support or be consequential on giving effect to the height and density requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD – nor can they be linked with providing for qualifying matters under Policy 4. Such provisions include clauses (b), (c), (d), (e), and (j). It is debatable as to whether the remaining clauses could be included in an IPI under the restrictions of Sections 80E and 80G of the RMA. Nonetheless, it would be unwise to do so as they are</p>	



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>and achieves outcomes additional to stormwater treatment such as providing amenity spaces, ecological habitat etc. (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(i) and (f)).</p> <p>(h) Insert policies and rules and/or rule requirements that restrict the use of copper and zinc building materials so as to minimise the effects of these materials on water quality. Retain the building coverage standard of 50% for GRZ-S3 and 70% for HRZ-S4 but include 'the degree of water sensitive urban design' as a matter of discretion where the building coverage standard cannot be met. The Medium and High Density Design Guide could also be amended to expand the Stormwater Management section to be more explicit on the Principles of Water sensitive Urban design (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(i)).</p> <p>(i) Amend policies and rules to control subdivision, vegetation clearance and earthworks and prevent inappropriate activities and buildings in riparian margins (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(l)).</p> <p>(j) Include a policy and objective to protect and enhance the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, including wetlands.</p>		<p>still proposed RPS provisions that are subject to submissions, and therefore may be subject to change.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(k) As a matter of control or discretion for subdivision and any other applicable activity, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i the extent to which the subdivision, use or development effects water quality, waterway values including hydrological and ecosystem processes, riparian margins, water users and cultural values.</li> <li>ii the location, scale, construction and environmental effects of stormwater infrastructure and the extent to which the stormwater infrastructure contributes to amenity, recreational, cultural, ecological and climate values in addition to its engineering purpose (any financial contribution or</li> <li>iii development contribution required for any offsite stormwater quality and quantity treatment.</li> </ul> <p>(l) Amendments may be required across the IPI to address the relief sought.</p>			
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Oppose the relief sought in this submission point as it goes beyond the scope of the IPI. The changes sought by the submitter are significant and have</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.5 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			not been subject to a s32 analysis or public notification.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: This submission point as it goes beyond the scope of the IPI. The changes sought by the submitter are significant and have not been subject to a s32 analysis or public notification.	Accept	Submission point S41.5 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.6	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Amend the IPI to: (a) Include a policy and amend relevant rules to require hydrological controls for use, development, and subdivision of land (Policy FW.3(j)) (b) Insert the definition of hydrological controls from the Proposed RPS Change 1. (c) Amendments may be needed in multiple chapters.	Reject	As required by Section 74(2)(a) the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 as discussed in the report and within this table. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.  In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council seeks amendments to Policy FW.3, Policy 14, and the proposed definition for 'hydrological controls'. It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council is seeking amendments on.  A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:            These matters are appropriately dealt with under the Proposed RPS Change 1. The provisions applying to hydraulic neutrality in the notified IPI are appropriate subject to the amendments sought by the RVA in its primary submission.</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
			<p>OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:            These matters are appropriately dealt with under the Proposed RPS Change 1. The provisions applying to hydraulic neutrality in the notified IPI are appropriate subject to the amendments sought by Ryman in its primary submission.</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.9	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Amend the IPI to:</p> <p>(a) Incorporate policies and rules to require improved water use efficiency for new developments.</p> <p>(b) Incorporate subdivision standards to require alternative water supplies for non-potable use i.e., roof water capture in new developments.</p> <p>(c) (Require new development to ensure adequate available water supply in a changing climate now and into the future.</p> <p>It is anticipated that amendments would be incorporated into multiple chapters.</p>	Reject	<p>As required by Section 74(2)(a) the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 as discussed in the report and within this table. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council opposes and seeks amendments to the relevant RPS Change 1 provisions comprising Policy CC.14 (Climate-resilient urban areas) and FW.2 (Reducing water demand – district plans). Upper Hutt City Council's submission also seeks amendments to Policy FW.1 (Reducing water demand), and FW.3 (Urban development effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area). It is not considered</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes or is seeking amendments on.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	
OPPOSED BY: FS3 – Bob Anker			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Given the intensification provisions in NPS–UD it is difficult to understand how GWRC considers this concept to be viable. Water storage tanks require an area of space that in all probability will not be available. There is also a considerable cost factor in duplicating separate plumbing lines when there is pressure to keep housing costs down. Not only would the split system require separate plumbing but there would need to be pumps to enable distribution around the dwelling. “Non-potable use” needs clearer definition and a greater understanding of volumes required with the household.</p> <p>GWRC is responsible for the provision and reticulation of water and need to be actively undertaking planning and work to meet a predictable increase in</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.9 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			demand. Local Authorities are required to project future demand for housing and enable housing supply to take place – Regional Council is responsible for the provision of drinking water, and it is their responsibility to take variable factors into account in order to meet demand. At no point do GWRC make any reference to Three (five) Waters in relation to their submissions on water related matters.			
	OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION: The RVA does not oppose the relief sought in this submission point in principle, however seeks further clarification on the relief sought.	Accept in part	Submission point S41.9 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION: Ryman does not oppose the relief sought in this submission point in principle, However seeks further clarification on the relief sought.	Accept in part	Submission point S41.9 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.10	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Include policies which seek to improve climate resilience of urban areas through measures identified in Policy CC.14 of Proposed RPS Change 1.  Include policies and rules for new development areas that require the development to include actions and initiatives that improve climate resilience.  Include matter of control or discretion in relevant rules that considers the extent	Reject	As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.  In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council opposes and seeks the deletion of proposed Policy CC.14 (Climate-resilient urban areas). It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			to which the development within the design will improve climate resilience.		<p>submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes and is seeking be deleted.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	
S41.11	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Objective for the transport system to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and private vehicles recognising contributing to reduction in GHG emissions (Proposed RPS Change 1 Objective CC.3).</li> <li>(b) Objective for new subdivision, use and development to minimise reliance on private vehicles and maximise use of public transport and active transport modes.</li> <li>(c) Policy that sets out a preference for freight distribution centres and high trip generating activities to locate in areas that are in close proximity to efficient transport networks.</li> <li>(d) Policy that enables the development of zero and low carbon and public transport</li> </ul>	Reject	<p>As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council seeks amendments to the relevant RPS Change 1 provisions comprising Policy CC.9 (Reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport infrastructure), and Policy CC.10 – Freight movement efficiency and minimising greenhouse gas emissions). Upper Hutt City Council's submission also opposes Policy CC.2 (Travel demand management plans – district plans), Policy CC.3 (Enabling a shift to low and zero-carbon emissions transport – district plans), and Policy 57 (Integrating Land use and transportation). It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>infrastructure (i.e., charging stations, park, and ride facilities).</p> <p>(e) Rules to permit the development of appropriate zero carbon, public transport, and active transport infrastructure.</p> <p>(f) Policy that requires the provision of infrastructure in subdivision development that supports modal shift and consideration of how design can reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>(g) Rule and associated standard that requires end of trip cycling facilities for staff (showers and lockers). The standard should be scaled for the number of staff cycle parks provided.</p> <p>(h) Amend/include standards to require EV or e-bike charging stations, including for residential development.</p> <p>(i) Amend/include standards that specify requirements for safe cycle lanes, pedestrian crossings, cycle parks.</p> <p>(j) Matter of control or discretion for subdivision, comprehensive housing development and commercial activity rules (and similar) a requirement to consider the extent to which the development provides for zero or low carbon, public and active transport modes.</p> <p>(k) Include provisions to prescribe thresholds for when consent applicants must prepare travel</p>		<p>Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes or is seeking amendments on.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>demand management plans (integrated transport assessments). The thresholds can be size of the subdivision, number of dwellings, people, floor size of retail development etc. It should apply to residential, education, office, industrial, community, entertainment and other land use activities that could generate higher private vehicle and freight travel. Provisions should also require that travel demand management plans include measures to reduce reliance on private vehicles and encourage modal shift to low carbon, active or public transport options.</p>			
OPPOSED BY FS3 – Bob Anker			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  It is not clear if the intention is that this should apply to new commercial building or whether existing buildings are to be retrofitted. This is a matter that should be negotiated between employer and employee and not dictated by regulation. UHCC does not have the power or a mandate for measures of this nature and it is questionable if GWRC does either for what amounts to Social Engineering.</p> <p>The provision of public transport is outside the control of UHCC. The service provider is GWRC. If this objective is to have any effect, then it requires an undertaking from GWRC to provide public transport when requested</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.11 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			otherwise we are creating a Catch 22 situation.			
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose the introduction of a rule and/or standard requiring provision of charging stations in order for a development to be considered a Permitted Activity. The additional cost to a development for infrastructure that may or may not be utilised is considered unnecessary. In addition, more emphasis should be made on alternative modes of transport rather than personal vehicles.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose introduction as a matter of control or discretion the extent to which the development provides for zero or low carbon, public and active transport modes.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose the introduction of travel demand plan requirements for subdivision, number of dwellings, or number of people in the context of residential development. Kāinga Ora consider that travel management is better undertaken at a neighbourhood scale and that they are prepared by councils rather than applicants.</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.11 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:</p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new provisions. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications</p>	Reject	Submission point S41.11 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.			
	OPPOSED AND SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION AND SUPPORT: The RVA supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on the RVA's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), the RVA considers that these various provisions should not apply to retirement villages.	Accept in part	Submission point S41.11 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the intent of this submission point in principle, however due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents and based on Ryman's primary position that active modes / public transport are less relevant considerations for retirement villages (given their functional and operational needs), Ryman considers that these various provisions should not apply to retirement villages.	Accept in part	Submission point S41.11 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.12	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Amend the IPI as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12:	Reject	As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(a) Include policy that seeks nature-based solutions when providing for new infrastructure and in new developments, such as the use of green infrastructure.</p> <p>(b) Permit the development of green infrastructure in appropriate locations and subject to necessary controls, i.e., planting works undertaken by regional council.</p> <p>(c) As a matter of control or discretion for subdivision include the extent to which the design protects, enhances, restores, or creates nature-based solutions to manage the effects of climate change, or similar.</p> <p>(d) Include provisions for recognising the functions of the ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to climate change and avoid adverse effects of subdivision, use and development on their functions, including before they are mapped. Policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i direct the protection of areas that already perform a function as a nature based solution, including the many wider benefits these can have and</li> <li>ii encourage the restoration of nature-based solutions.</li> </ul> <p>(e) Amendments may be necessary across the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport, Natural Hazards, and Subdivision provisions.</p>		<p>change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council opposes and seeks the deletion of Policies CC.7 (Protecting, restoring, and enhancing ecosystems and habitats that provide nature-based solutions to climate change), and Policy CC.12 (Protect, enhance and restore ecosystems that provide nature-based solutions to climate change). It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes and seeks their deletion.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: Bob Anker			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>This introduces clauses from Proposed Plan Change 1 to the RPS which are opposed in submissions from myself and my community. The identification of areas that are mooted to perform a function as a Nature Based Solution is contested as is the concept of Restoration. We specifically object to the inclusion of the Mangaroa Peatlands under the questionable concept that protection is to protect carbon stores. No clarity has been given as to what form “protection” would take and whether it would run contrary to the decisions in Adams &amp; Ors.</p> <p>It appears to my community that this amounts to an exercise in deception by GWRC who maintained, when questioned, that the reference to Peat as part of the Plan Change 1 definition of “Nature Based Solution” was simply an example. It is our opinion that the cunning and deliberate way in which GWRC is attempting to insert “Nature Based Solutions” into the IPI and hence the entire District Plan, is disingenuous at best and downright dishonest at worst.</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.12 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:</p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new provisions. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is</p>	Reject	Submission point S41.12 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.			
S41.13	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Amend the intensification Planning Instrument as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.8: (a) Identify the type and scale of activities were reducing greenhouse gases rather than offsetting must occur and (b) Include objectives, policies, rules to require greenhouse gases to be reduced rather than offset for the type and scale of activities identified.	Reject	As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.  In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council opposes and seeks the deletion of Policy CC.8 (Prioritising greenhouse gas emissions reduction over offsetting). It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes and seeks their deletion.  A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.	No
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new provisions. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications	Reject	Submission point S41.13 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.			
S41.14	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Renewable Energy	Retain renewable energy generation provisions as notified.	Accept	Only consequential amendments to give effect to the MDRS are proposed to the renewable energy provisions.	No
S41.15	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Include direction in the District Plan, including infrastructure and subdivision provisions, to provide for de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using approved alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks, due to their existing issues with contamination and leaching) anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network should still be required.</p> <p>This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.</p>	Reject	<p>As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>The submitter point to existing RPS provisions Policy 16 and 45 to support the requested relief. It is noted Policy 16 – (Promoting discharges to land) is a specific policy for regional plans, so it is therefore not a matter the Council is required to give effect to in its district plan.</p> <p>Policy 45 (Using water efficiently – consideration) is a consideration policy relevant to changes to the district plan. The policy requires <i>particular regard be given to requiring water collection, water demand management options, and water reuse and/or water recycling measures so that water is used efficiently</i>. Although it is agreed this policy addresses an important resource management issue, it is considered giving effect to it should be carried out in a comprehensive manner in combination with giving effect to all other freshwater provisions following RPS Change 1 becoming operative. It is also noted no</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>specific amendments are sought in the submission, making any specific recommendations to accept the submission problematic.</p> <p>With regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in its submission, Upper Hutt City Council opposes and seeks amendments to the relevant RPS Change 1 provisions comprising Policy FW.2 (Reducing water demand – district plans), Policy CC.4 (Climate resilient urban areas), and Policy 58 (Co-ordinating land use with development and operation of infrastructure). The Council's submission also seeks amendments to Policy FW.3 (Urban development effects on freshwater and the coastal marine area – district plans), and Policy FW.5 (Water supply planning for climate change and urban development). It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes and seeks their deletion.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	
OPPOSED BY: FS3 – Bob Anker			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:	Accept	Submission point S41.15 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>It is difficult to understand why GWRC would believe that this suggestion would be an improvement on the status quo. As I understand the IPI, it is the intention of UHCC that infrastructure enhancements needed as a result of urban intensification would need to be addressed by the party undertaking the development. It would appear that GWRC is suggesting that there should be a number of sewage treatment plants spread throughout the community with little thought as to what will happen with the treated outfall from these plants. There is no consideration as to reverse sensitivity nor to the impact on the wider Rural community.</p> <p>GWRC is also stressing that approved systems should be used but there is no clarity as to precisely what the approved systems are.</p>			
S41.19	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <p>(a) Include an objective that mana whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity are recognised and involvement in decision making and management is supported.</p> <p>(b) Include policy that requires mana whenua involvement in the mapping of indigenous biodiversity, including to identify taonga species.</p>	Reject	<p>As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>The following provides specific responses to the majority of the requested amendments, the remainder of the requested amendments are addressed following this list of specific responses:</p> <p>(a), (c) and (f): With regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in its submission, Upper Hutt City</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(c) Include policy to enable mana whenua to undertake customary activities in accordance with tikanga such as customary harvest of mahinga kai species.</p> <p>(d) Include policy to support provision of access to indigenous biodiversity sites.</p> <p>(e) Include permitted activity rules for the cultural harvesting of mahinga kai, for example indigenous vegetation removal.</p> <p>(f) In relevant rules, for example indigenous vegetation clearance, include as a matter of control or discretion, the adverse effects on mahinga kai, other customary uses, and access for these activities.</p> <p>(g) Provisions could require management plans for managing offset biodiversity areas and managing effects on significant areas. Monitoring requirements would form part of these plans and plan direction could encourage the adoption of matauranga Māori in monitoring of indigenous species in relevant circumstances.</p>		<p>Council Supports and seeks the retention of Policy IE.1 (Giving effect to mana whenua / tangata whenua roles and values when managing indigenous biodiversity). However, the proposed policy is subject to multiple other submissions seeking a variety of decisions including the complete deletion of Policy IE.1. Therefore, the final form (and existence) of proposed Policy IE.1 is unknown.</p> <p>(d), (e) and (g): With regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in its submission, Upper Hutt City Council Supports and seeks the retention of Policy IE.2 (Inventory of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation opportunities). However, the proposed policy is subject to multiple other submissions seeking a variety of decisions including the complete deletion of Policy IE.2. Therefore, the final form (and existence) of proposed Policy IE.2 is unknown.</p> <p>Despite Upper Hutt City Council's general support for the relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions, it is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions that are subject to multiple submission seeking a variety of changes including their complete deletion.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p> <p>It is also noted many of the amendments sought by submission point S41.19 appear to be based on the draft NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). Draft national policy statements have no statutory weight as a matter that must be considered, taken into account, or given effect to in a district plan under the RMA. Should the draft NPS-IB come into force, the Council will be required to give effect to it via a Schedule 1 RMA plan change. It is not appropriate to give effect to a draft national policy statement, as its final form is unknown and there is always a chance it may not be gazetted at all.</p>	
<p>OPPOSED BY: FS3 – Bob Anker</p>			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  The concept of enabling involvement is not problematic. It should be noted, however, that there is a change of language in the following section which has the effect of making involvement mandatory which is problematic:</p> <p><i>Include policy that requires mana whenua involvement in the mapping of indigenous biodiversity, including to identify taonga species.</i></p> <p>Here we have a change that mandates mana whenua involvement in the mapping process and that, in itself, is</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>Submission point S41.19 is recommended for rejection.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>not acceptable. The implication is that any mapping that takes place without mana whenua involvement is not valid.</p> <p>There needs to be a statement that private land is exempted from the requested policy to policy to enable mana whenua to undertake customary activities in accordance with tikanga such as customary harvest of mahinga kai species.</p>			
S41.20	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) A new policy (or amend existing policy) to protect the values of the natural features and landscapes when providing for subdivision.</li> <li>(b) Amend existing policy to provide direction around minimising the effects of subdivision, use and development on the values of natural features and landscapes.</li> </ul>	Reject	<p>It is acknowledged the Council is in the process of preparing a plan change to address natural features and landscape values within the City to ensure the District Plan better gives effect to RMA Section 6(b) and operative RPS Policies 25, 26 and 50 with respect to the identification and protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Work is also underway to identify and protect significant natural areas in urban areas. Informal consultation is being carried out with affected property owners on the draft evidence base and potential district plan methods.</p> <p>The District Plan does not include specifically identified outstanding natural features and landscapes for the purposes of RMA Section 6(b) or RPS Policies 25 and 26, and therefore the IPI cannot include them as an existing qualifying matter.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					It is not considered appropriate to amend the IPI to provide the amendments requested by submission point S41.20 as the natural features and landscapes, and significant natural areas evidence bases are still in draft form and consultation with affected property owners on a potential plan change(s) are on-going. Provisions to achieve the identification and protection of significant natural features and landscapes are recommended to be addressed in a comprehensive rather than piecemeal way, and on this basis, it is recommended the requested relief is not provided via the IPI.	
S41.34	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Include matter of control or discretion to require proper disposal of building waste when redeveloping sites/infill development (e.g., demolition).	Reject	The submitter cites operative RPS Policy 34 as the basis for the requested relief. It is noted RPS Policy 34 is specific to controlling activities on contaminated land. The Policy does not require district plans to include matters of control or discretion to require proper disposal of building waste when redeveloping sites/infill development (e.g., demolition). No other operative RPS policies have been identified that could require the district plan to provide the requested provisions. On this basis it is recommended the submission point be rejected.	No
S50.4	Waka Kotahi	Entire IPI	That the IPI more fully recognise the role that safety and accessibility to active and public transport contribute towards the delivery of a well-functioning environment as per Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020 (NPS UD).	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended in response to other submission points raised by submitter S50 – Waka Kotahi.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington supports the need for the IPI to recognise the role of safety and accessibility to active and public transport, as this would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Accept in part	Submission point S50.4 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S50.5	Waka Kotahi	Entire IPI	Support with amendments and other consequential relief to ensure safety and accessibility to active modes and public transport are appropriately addressed in the IPI.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended in response to other submission points raised by submitter S50 – Waka Kotahi.	No
S53.14	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	Not stated.	Accept in part	The support for the IPI is noted however amendments to the IPI are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S56.68	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	This submission seeks to enable Fire and Emergency to carry out its requirements under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 more effectively in the protection of people, property, and the environment in the event of an emergency.	Accept in part	The submission does not seek any specific amendments, however each of submitter's submission points are addressed individually throughout this table. In summary it is considered the IPI does not prevent Fire and Emergency New Zealand from carrying out its requirements under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 as the provision of water supply for firefighting purposes, and access to buildings requirements are already provided for either via the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works, or other legislation such as the Building Act and Building Code.	No
S56.69	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	This submission addresses matters relating to activities required to be undertaken to enable an effective emergency response and to provide for the health and safety of people and communities in Upper Hutt.	Accept in part	It is considered the IPI enables effective emergency response and the ability to provide for the health and safety of people and communities in Upper Hutt to the degree possible under the RMA. It is noted there are other non-RMA methods in place	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					that are more appropriate for achieving some of the submitter's requested decisions on the IPI.	
S56.70	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	To support effective and efficient access and manoeuvring of crew and equipment for firefighting, medical, rescue and other emergency response to pedestrian only access developments across Upper Hutt (should such developments be provided for).	Reject	Emergency access requirements are chiefly addressed via non-RMA methods, such as the Building Act and Building Code. Provision of and access to water for firefighting purposes is addressed by the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.	No
S56.71	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	Adequate fire appliance access to both the source of a fire (or other emergency) and a firefighting water supply is essential to the efficient operation of Fire and Emergency. The requirements for firefighting access are set out in the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 (SNZ PAS 4509:2008), are further detailed in Fire and Emergency's 'Designer's guide' to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access' (December 2021) and prescribed in Acceptable Solutions Part 6 of C/AS1 and C/AS2.	Reject	Emergency access requirements are primarily addressed via non-RMA methods, such as the Building Act and Building Code.  Access to, and provision of water supply for firefighting purposes is addressed by the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.  No specific amendments are recommended to the IPI to include additional firefighting appliance access requirements. This matter is addressed under multiple submission points in this table where the submitter has requested similar amendments across multiple chapters.  It is not recommended to duplicate any building consent requirements for firefighting access in the IPI.	No
S56.72	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	For all other developments to which C5 applies, Fire and Emergency request that, were not already provided for, the district plan introduces rules that 'duplicate' the appropriate requirements of the Part 6: firefighting of C/AS1 and C/AS2.	Reject	The duplication within the District Plan of standards or acceptable building solutions that must already be met under other legislation is not considered appropriate.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S56.73	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Fire and Emergency is already encountering new development where emergency vehicle access along the roading corridor has been challenging. Issues with emergency vehicle access in these locations can be caused by narrow roads / laneways, higher density typologies and a lack of off-street parking available resulting in cars parking along both sides of already narrow residential streets. Implications for emergency services include on-road obstructions, meaning emergency vehicles have difficulty or are unable to manoeuvre, as well as an inability to access buildings and locate fire hydrants in an emergency. Inadequate parking lengths along frontages also have been encountered generally from vehicles parking over footpaths in driveways, blocking access. Fire and Emergency acknowledges that, where no off-street parking is required, there may also be no requirement to provide for vehicular access to a property. In these situations, emergency service staff would need to enter a property on foot and/or remove fences and other structures to provide access. Regardless, there needs to be sufficient clearance to access properties with heavy emergency equipment. Fire and Emergency request that UHCC retain a policy framework that would enable such conditions to be imposed on a case-by-case basis, having regard to the effects of a particular activity. This could include, for example, matters of</p>	Reject	<p>Addressing the concerns raised by submission point S56.73 would require a comprehensive review of the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works, and the identification of other non-RMA methods that may apply to determine whether the District Plan is the most appropriate method to address these concerns. It is agreed the submitter raises important issues, however they are not able to be addressed via the IPI due to timeframes and the need to prepare an evidence base to support any provisions – including considering whether the District Plan is the most appropriate method. It is recommended the submitter discusses their concerns with the Council to be addressed via a potential future non-IPI plan change process. This could potentially be addressed in part via a future review of the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.</p>	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			discretion relating to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, surrounding car parking supply, and on and off-street amenity effects.			
S56.74	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	Clause C3 of the NZBC is relevant here whereby buildings must be designed and constructed so that there is a low probability of fire spread to other property vertically or horizontally across a relevant boundary. Achieving this functional requirement is however limited by the mechanisms by which this is achieved (i.e., Acceptable Solutions) and buildings of which such requirements apply. Fire and Emergency encourage UHCC to consider integrating these considerations into relevant urban design guidelines to align with the NZBC and prompt developments to consider fire risk mitigations early on in design. This should also be included as an advice note with the relevant side and rear boundary setback rules within the IPI plan change.	Reject	Addressing the risk of fire spreading from buildings to other buildings is best addressed via the Building Act and Building Code. It is unclear how addressing these matters via the District Plan could be more effective than relying on the Building Act/Code.	No
S56.75	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	Fire and Emergency consider it essential that urban development does not occur out of sequence with the delivery of key strategic infrastructure (network extensions or upgrades), or development is not enabled where there is potential or known infrastructure capacity constraints in relation to the Three Waters, in particular the water supply network. Fire and Emergency consider that UHCC will need to develop more sophisticated water network models where they do not already exist.	Accept in part	It is not possible for the IPI to prevent the level of permitted activity development enabled by the incorporation of the MDRS or giving effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. It is the role of financial contributions/ development contributions to help meet the costs of providing additional infrastructure to service growth.  It is noted that matters of discretion are included in relevant IPI rules that require the Council to consider whether the Water Supply, Stormwater and Wastewater	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			This will assist UHCC in identifying areas across Upper Hutt where there is potential or known infrastructure capacity constraints and will enable UHCC to manage the cumulative impacts of urban infill on the water supply network.		infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed activity/development. Conditions can be imposed or resource consent refused in the event of significant infrastructure effects.	
S56.76	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Entire IPI	Provisions within the rules of the district plan therefore may be the best way to facilitate the development of any new emergency service facilities as the city grows. Ongoing, and more frequent engagement with Fire and Emergency in terms of growth projections and demographic changes will assist us in understanding where we may need new emergency service facilities in the future. This will be particularly important during plan review and plan changes that seek to re-zone large portions of land to facilitate development.	Accept in part	It is agreed updated growth projections and demographic changes will assist in Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the Council planning for growth.	No
S57.1	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Entire IPI	Ryman seeks the decisions sought by the RVA (Retirement Village Association) in its submission on the Proposed IPI.	Accept in part	Some of the RVAS's submission points are recommended to be accepted or accepted in part, while others are recommended for rejection.	No
S58.1	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Entire IPI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Changes to the centre's hierarchy and commercial provisions in the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones to improve regional consistency to enable and support increased intensification across the City.</li> <li>2. Expand the spatial extent of some centres and amend residential intensification standards, as sought in the rest of the submission, to</li> </ol>	Reject	All of these specific requested amendments are recommended for rejection under more specific submission points. See specific submission points regarding specific centres for details.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops.</p> <p>3. If the relief sought in this submission regarding expansion of the spatial extent to centres is not granted, Kāinga Ora seeks that alternative outcomes and relief sought in this submission (e.g., height variation control in the HRZ) are applied and granted. Where the alternative relief is sought, this is captured more specifically in Appendix 1.</p> <p>4. Undertake any consequential changes necessary across the UHCC District Plan to address the matters raised above.</p>			
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.1 is recommended for rejection.	
S58.3	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Entire IPI	<p>1. Amend standards across the plan to be proportionate to the building height changes sought in this submission and detailed in the planning maps in Appendix 4 of this submission.</p>	Reject	<p>All of the submitter's requested building height amendments are recommended for rejection under other specific submission points.</p> <p>The IPI gives effect to the requirements of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. The</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			2. Undertake any consequential changes necessary across the District Plan to address the matters raised above.		submitter's requested spatial amendments to zoning and height increases are not considered to be the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives.  Further it is noted that no consultation with property owners who would be directly affected by the rezoning requests have been consulted with (chiefly residential zoned sites requested by the submitter to be rezoned to a centre zone).	
S58.5	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Entire IPI	1. Amend the proposed objectives, policies, rules and standards as necessary to achieve compliance with the requirements of the National Planning Standards as sought by this submission. 2. Amend the proposed objectives, policies, rules and standards as necessary to improve consistency and conciseness across the IPI as sought by the submission.	Accept in part	Amendments to IPI provisions are recommended in response to some of the submitter's more specific requested amendments.	No
S58.8	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Appendix 1 and 2	Retain deletion of Appendix 1 - Residential Centres Precinct, and Appendix 2 - Residential Hill and Residential Conservation Precinct as notified.	Accept	The deletion of these precincts is necessary to remove provisions that conflict with the MDRS and policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	No
S58.10	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	General Approach	Retain deletion of 2.4.7 and 2.4.8 as notified.	Accept	The deletion of the comprehensive residential development provisions is necessary to remove provisions that conflict with the MDRS and policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	No
S58.21	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Entire IPI	Retain abbreviation for National Policy Statement on Urban Development as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the abbreviation for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.14	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	All Zones - policies	Seek a new policy is included in all zones that recognises the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites: <u>Larger sites: Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>	Reject	It is noted neither the MDRS nor Policy 3 of the NPS-UD provide a policy disincentive for the creation of larger sites as part of recognising intensification opportunities in residential zones. However, the MDRS does enable the District Plan to specify minimum allotment sizes where vacant allotments are proposed to provide the Council with the ability to ensure proposed vacant allotments are capable of accommodating one or more residential units.  There are no policy or rule impediments to the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within residential zones.	No
S64.16	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	All Zones - policies	Seek a new policy is included in all zones, as follows: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing Population:</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in Medium Density Residential Areas, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have a unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>  Delete or amend other Commercial Zone objectives and policies for consistency.	Reject	This submission point is recommended for rejection.  A specific ageing population policy is not necessary. Housing for ageing populations is provided for via provisions that enable and manage residential units within all zones.  The requested new objective and policy would focus the policy direction within the zone chapters on provisions of housing for the elderly, while other groups in housing need are not specifically referred to. The objective and policy direction in the IPI for housing has been prepared to give effect to NPS-UD Objective 1, and Policy 1(a)(i) – i.e. to enable a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households.  With respect to retirement villages, it is considered that although they provide an important source of housing for a specific	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					demographic of the population, they are defined as a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are specifically provided for within the centres and mixed-use zones, and residential zones (as non-residential activities). The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	
OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  NZDF is not supportive of this submission as notification of applications will allow reverse sensitivity matters to be addressed and mitigated.	Accept	Submission point S64.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S64.136	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	Seek that the IPI addresses the critical need for and shortage of retirement accommodation and aged care. Submit proposed amendments to address and / or any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.	Reject	It is noted the District Plan does not prevent or discourage the provision of retirement accommodation and aged care in the City. Retirement villages require a resource consent due to the typical scale and mixture of activities they contain, while <i>rest homes</i> and <i>community care housing</i> are provided for as permitted activities in residential zones. No specific policy impediment has	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					been identified within the District Plan that would result in difficulty for obtaining resource consents for retirement villages in the City.	
S64.137	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	Submit proposed amendments to address and / or any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.	Accept in part	Amendments to IPI provisions are recommended in response to some of the submitter's more specific requested amendments.	No
S64.138	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of the MDRS, as a number of provisions as notified dilute, conflict with or overlap with the MDRS;</li> <li>• The relief sought in relation to specific provisions to make sure that they are workable for retirement villages including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The directiveness of the MDRS and the direction of the NPS-UD is not diluted through the addition of new, undefined concepts such as a 'high quality residential environment' or a 'pleasant and coherent'</li> <li>2. Objectives and policies that appropriately recognise the acute need for retirement housing and care in all relevant residential zones.</li> <li>3. Rules to enable retirement villages in the GRZ and HRZ.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Reject	<p>Retirement villages are already specifically provided for within the zones affected by the IPI via restricted discretionary and discretionary activity rules.</p> <p>Due to the potential scale of retirement villages, and the mix of uses they can include, the actual and potential effects that can arise from retirement villages makes it inappropriate to provide for them as permitted activities. This is because it is likely some of the adverse effects that may arise from retirement villages as a permitted activity may be contrary to the objectives and policies of the relevant zones.</p> <p>It is considered the most appropriate method to provide for them is via the IPI provisions as notified.</p> <p>Many of the components of this submission point are raised and addressed repeatedly within each zone chapter in this table. Please see the specific submission points for specific recommendations.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages</li> <li>5. Proportionate notification</li> <li>6. Clear, targeted, and appropriate development standards</li> <li>7. Providing for retirement villages in commercial zones</li> <li>8. A clear and transparent regime for financial contributions</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ul>			
S64.139	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of the MDRS, as a number of provisions as notified dilute, conflict with or overlap with the MDRS;</li> <li>• The relief sought in relation to specific provisions to make sure that they are workable for retirement villages including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The directiveness of the MDRS and the direction of the NPS-UD is not diluted through the addition of new, undefined concepts such as a 'high quality residential environment' or a 'pleasant and coherent'</li> <li>2. Objectives and policies that appropriately recognise the acute</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Reject	<p>NOTE: this submission point appears to repeat the decisions requested under submission point S64.139 above.</p> <p>The recommendation for this submission point is the same as that for submission point S64.139 above.</p>	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>need for retirement housing and care in all relevant residential zones</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Rules to enable retirement villages in the GRZ and HRZ.</li> <li>4. Tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages</li> <li>5. Proportionate notification</li> <li>6. Clear, targeted, and appropriate development standards</li> <li>7. Providing for retirement villages in commercial zones</li> <li>8. A clear and transparent regime for financial contributions</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ul>			
S64.141	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rules to enable retirement villages in the GRZ and HRZ.</li> <li>• Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ul>	Reject	<p>Retirement villages in residential zones are managed via discretionary activity rules GRZ-R21. This rule is not part of the IPI.</p> <p>It is not recommended to provide a retirement-village specific frameworks within residential zones as retirement villages represent a significant use of land in residential areas, and include a mix of residential, recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities. A significant and wide-ranging use of residential zoned land in the City could result in many adverse effects that require specific avoidance, remedying or mitigation. Therefore it is</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					recommended retirement villages remain a discretionary activity within the GRZ and HRZ.	
S64.142	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of the MDRS, as a number of provisions as notified dilute, conflict with or overlap with the MDRS;</li> <li>• The relief sought in relation to specific provisions to make sure that they are workable for retirement villages including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The directiveness of the MDRS and the direction of the NPS-UD is not diluted through the addition of new, undefined concepts such as a 'high quality residential environment' or a 'pleasant and coherent'</li> <li>2. Objectives and policies that appropriately recognise the acute need for retirement housing and care in all relevant residential zones</li> <li>3. Rules to enable retirement villages in the GRZ and HRZ.</li> <li>4. Tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages</li> <li>5. Proportionate notification</li> <li>6. Clear, targeted, and appropriate development standards</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Reject	<p>NOTE: this submission point appears to repeat the decisions requested under submission point S64.139 above.</p> <p>The recommendation for this submission point is the same as that for submission point S64.139 above.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>7. Providing for retirement villages in commercial zones</p> <p>8. A clear and transparent regime for financial contributions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ul>			
S64.143	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relief sought in relation to specific provisions to make sure that they are workable for retirement villages.</li> <li>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	<p>It is recommended to make a number of amendments to provisions in response to other submission points raised by submitter S64. However, many other submission points raised by the submitter are recommended for rejection.</p> <p>See the specific submission points for specific requested amendments and specific recommendations.</p>	No
S64.144	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportionate notification of consents.</li> <li>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>No amendments are recommended to introduce any specific notification clauses for resource consents for retirement villages. It is considered the actual and potential effects on the environment that could arise from a proposed retirement village may vary and will depend on the site and the surrounding environment. It is possible resulting effects may provide justification for either limited notification or public notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p>	No
S64.145	Retirement Villages	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p>	Reject	<p>Note: this submission point appears to be a repeat of submission point S64.144.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Association of New Zealand		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proportionate notification of consents</li> <li>2. Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ol>		No amendments are recommended to introduce any specific notification clauses for resource consents for retirement villages. It is considered the actual and potential effects on the environment that could arise from a proposed retirement village may vary and will depend on the site and the surrounding environment. It is possible resulting effects may provide justification for either limited notification or public notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis.	
S64.146	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proportionate notification of consents.</li> <li>2. Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>Note: this submission point appears to be a repeat of submission points S64.144 and S64.155 above.</p> <p>No amendments are recommended to introduce any specific notification clauses for resource consents for retirement villages. It is considered the actual and potential effects on the environment that could arise from a proposed retirement village may vary and will depend on the site and the surrounding environment. It is possible resulting effects may provide justification for either limited notification or public notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p>	No
S64.147	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	<p>Seek that the IPI is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rules to enable retirement villages in the commercial zones.</li> </ol>	Reject	All centres zones specifically provide for retirement villages via specific rules as either a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity. The specific provisions sought by the submitter for retirement villages are recommended for rejection for the reasons specified within	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			2. Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.		each of the relevant zone chapters in this table.	
S70.1	CBDI Limited and CBD Land Limited (late submission)	Maps	To retain the rezoning of lots 1-3 DP 456184 and Lot 2 DP 452529 to Mixed Use Zone from General Industrial Zone.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to the zoning of Lot 1 DP 456184 and Lot 2 DP 542529 from general industrial to mixed use zone in addition to sites zoned mixed use at notification. Lot 2 DP 456184 is not recommended for rezoning.	Yes
72.21	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	NU-P9	NU-P9 - Retain proposed change.	Accept	Policy NU-P9 is recommended for retention as notified.	No
72.22	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	REG-R9	REG-R9 - This rule to be recrafted to include matters of significance to Māori.	Reject	The IPI proposes only a consequential amendment to REG-R9 to update the list of applicable zones. Redrafting rule REG-R9 as requested is not within the scope of the IPI.	No
S72.24	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity – Whole chapter.	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Whole Chapter - Include matters recognising mana whenua values for indigenous biodiversity, support the involvement of mana whenua in decision making, enable cultural activities and recognise the role of mana whenua as kaitiaki.	Reject	It is noted the inclusion of significant natural areas to identify and protect ecosystems and biodiversity is subject to a future Council plan change. It is not proposed to include any additional areas or make changes to the matters within residential zones as part of the IPI as discussions with affected property owners is still being carried out by the Council.  It is also noted the requested relief appears to relate to Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions. It is not recommended to amend the IPI to give effect to any provisions within Proposed RPS Change 1 on the basis	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					the Council has a submission on the RPS plan change that seeks many amendments, and the final form of the provisions is unknown.	
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington strongly supports changes to the IPI to recognise mana whenua / tangata whenua values for indigenous biodiversity and enable mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in relevant decision making regarding indigenous biodiversity (e.g., the effects of urban intensification on indigenous biodiversity values). This relief would have regard to policies IE.1 and IE.2 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject	Submission point S72.24 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S72.25	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	General Subdivision Provisions that Apply in All Zones SUB-GEN-I2	General Subdivision Provisions that Apply in All Zones SUB-GEN-I2 - Retain proposed change (addition of reference to Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct).	Accept	The proposed reference to the Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct in SUB-GEN-I2 is recommended to be retained.	No
S27.13	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Strategic Direction	Retain the additional text in respect of existing qualifying matter areas in the existing Strategic Direction.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the text supported by this submission.	No
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT: NZDF supports the amendment to the existing Strategic Direction because the amendment appropriately recognises the relationship of qualifying matters to the extent of development through the inclusion of "... existing qualifying matter	Accept	Submission S27.13 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible in an allotment.”			
S43.6	KiwiRail	UFD Strategic Direction	Amend UFD - Residential as follows: 'Within the General Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone <del>existing</del> qualifying matters may limit the amount of permitted <del>medium density</del> development possible on an allotment.'	Accept	It is agreed the requested amendments improve the description of the zones in which qualifying matter areas may affect permitted development.	Yes
S50.9	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	Entire IPI	Amend Strategic Direction to include reference to 'accessible by active and public transport'. See submission for specific amendments requested.	Reject	The requested additional text is unnecessary as accessibility via walking to public transport is the basis for the identification of the High Density Residential Zone. It is not necessary to repeat this within the Strategic Direction descriptive text.	No
S58.7	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-HRZ, SUB-RES, GRZ, HRZ, MRZ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the SUB-HRZ chapter and delete the proposed amendment to SUB-RES to make it specific to the General Residential Zone. Combine subdivision in the GRZ and the HRZ into the SUB-RES chapter.</li> <li>Rename the GRZ as the MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.28	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Entire IPI	Amend the strategic direction provisions to state that residential development is also provided with centre and mixed use zones. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	Amendments are recommended under other specific submission points made by submitter S58.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Accept	Submission point S58.28 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Accept	Submission point S58.28 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S41.17	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Retain UFD-O3, UFD-P2, and amendments to existing Strategic Direction relating to Residential as notified.	Accept in part	The submitter's support is acknowledged; however, amendments are recommended to UFD-O3 to correct errors in response to submission S5.5 – Bob Anker.  Amendments are also recommended to UFD-P2 to correct errors in response to submission point S5.4 – Bob Anker.	No
S64.8	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Strategic Direction – Urban Form and Development – Residential Explanation	Amend the Residential Explanation as follows: ...and will be a matter of discretion for medium and high density residential development that requires a resource consent ( <u>except for retirement villages</u> ).	Reject	The requested relief is a consequential amendment to the submitters requests under other submission points to make retirement villages a permitted activity. The requested relief under the other submission points is not recommended to be accepted for the reasons provided in those submission points.	No
S27.9	Transpower New Zealand Limited	UFD-O1	Retain objective UFD-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-O1 are recommended.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports proposed Objective UFD-O1, and particularly the inclusion of reference to people and communities' health, safety and wellbeing. This objective indirectly supports the management of reverse sensitivity by ensuring the management of the communities' health, safety and wellbeing.	Accept	Submission S27.9 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S41.18	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI; and UFD-O1	<p>Amend UFD-O1 (well-functioning urban environment) and other relevant policies in the IPI to include environmental components of wellbeing and have regard to the articulation of the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments set out in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.</p> <p>Ensure all Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.</p>	Reject	<p>As required by Section 74(2)(a) and addressed in the report and in this table, the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>In its submission on Proposed RPS Change 1, Upper Hutt City Council opposes and seeks amendments to Objective 22 on the basis the objective goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD, and what an RPS can specify a district plan must do to give effect to the NPS-UD. It is not considered appropriate for Greater Wellington Regional Council to seek via a submission on the IPI the inclusion of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions the Council opposes and seeks amendments to.</p> <p>A hearing on RPS Change 1 is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of its provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	No
S56.2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	UFD-O1 and CMU-O1	UFD-O1 and CMU-O1 - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-O1 are recommended.	No
S58.22	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	UFD-O1	Retain UFD-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-O1 are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	UFD-01	Retain Objective UFD-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-01 are recommended.	No
S27.10	Transpower New Zealand Limited	UFD-02	Retain objective UFD-02 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-02 are recommended.	No
S28.3	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	UFD-02	Amend Objective UFD-02 as follows: UFD-02 Relevant residential zones provide for a variety of housing types, <u>households</u> , and sizes that respond to: a. Housing needs and demands; and ...	Reject	UFD-02 incorporates the mandatory MDRS objective in Clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.	No
S58.23	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	UFD-02	Retain UFD-02 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-02 are recommended.	No
S64.3	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	UFD-02	Retain Objective UFD-02 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-02 are recommended.	No
S5.5	(Bob) Robert Anker	UFD-03	That the entire document be checked to ensure that definitions are constant throughout.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S50.6	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	UFD-03	Amend UFD-03 as shown in the submission to delete 'walkability' and insert 'active transport, bus routes'. See submission for details.	Reject	The High Density Residential Zone spatial extent is identified via walkable catchments in accordance with Policy 3(c)(i) and (ii) of the NPS-UD. Active transport and bus routes are not part of the methodology used in the identification of the High Density Residential Zone.	No
S58.24	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	UFD-03	Retain UFD-03 as notified.	Reject	Support for UFD-03 is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.4	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	UFD-03	Amend UFD-03 as follows: 1. Identified housing needs and demand.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S27.11	Transpower New Zealand Limited	UFD-04	Retain objective UFD-04 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-04 as notified are recommended.	No
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  NZDF supports proposed Objective UFD-04, and particularly the inclusion of reference to the following continuing to be provided for as qualifying matters: - “give effect to national policy statements”; and - “ensure the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure”. Such an approach gives effect to Policy 4 of the NPS-UD and promotes the safe and efficient operation of NZDF facilities, provided NZDF facilities are included as Nationally Significant Infrastructure.	Accept	Submission S27.11 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S43.4	KiwiRail	UFD-04	Retain UFD-04 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-04 as notified are recommended.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  NZDF supports proposed Objective UFD-04, and particularly the inclusion of reference to the following continuing to be provided for as qualifying matters: - “give effect to national policy statements”; and - “ensure the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure”. Such an	Accept	Submission S43.4 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			approach gives effect to Policy 4 of the NPS-UD and promotes the safe and efficient operation of NZDF facilities, provided NZDF facilities are included as Nationally Significant Infrastructure.			
S58.26	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	UFD-O4	Retain UFD-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-O4 as notified are recommended.	No
S50.7	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	UFD-P1	Retain UDF-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to UFD-P1 as notified are recommended.	No
S50.8	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	UFD-P2 (NOTE: the amendments sought only apply to UFD-P1).	Amend policy UDF-P2 to include consideration of accessibility and alternate modes of transport. See submission for specific amendments requested. NOTE: The amendments sought relate to UFD-P1.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.6	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	UFD-P1	Expressly exclude retirement villages from UFD-P1.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S5.6	(Bob) Robert Anker	UFD-P2 – clause 2	Amend the document to make it clear whether Town Centre, Local Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Zones are enclaves with their own set of rules or are they covered by the High Density Zone rules. If the latter is the case, then the document needs to be reviewed in its entirety to remove any inconsistencies.	Reject	No overlap of zone boundaries on the Planning Maps has been identified. The zone provisions only apply to the relevant zones as identified on the Planning Maps. The provisions of each zone are a complete set that apply to the zone of a specific property as identified on the Planning Maps.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S27.12	Transpower New Zealand Limited	UFD-P2	Retain policy UFD-P2 as notified.	Reject	Support for UFD-P2 is acknowledged, however amendments and consequential amendments are recommended to correct errors in response to submission point S5.4 and S5.5.	No
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  NZDF supports proposed Policy UFD-P2 on the basis that NZDF's proposed 'reverse sensitivity buffer area' is Included as a qualifying matter area.	Reject	Submission point S27.12 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S43.5	KiwiRail	UFD-P2	Retain UFD-P2 as notified.	Reject	Support for UFD-P2 is acknowledged, however amendments and consequential amendments are recommended to correct errors in response to submission point S5.4 and S5.5.	No
S58.27	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	UFD-P2	Amend UFD-P2 to enable building heights of 'at least' 12m, 26m, and 36m in height within 400m of the edge of the City Centre Zone. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.7	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	UFD-P2	Retain UFD-P2 as notified.	Reject	Support for UFD-P2 is acknowledged, however amendments and consequential amendments are recommended to correct errors in response to submission point S5.4 and S5.5.	No
S27.14	Transpower New Zealand Limited	CMU-O1	Retain objective CMU-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-O1 as notified are recommended.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  NZDF supports proposed Objective CMU-O1, and particularly the inclusion of reference to people and communities'	Accept	Submission S27.14 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			health, safety, and wellbeing. NZDF supports any provision that promotes the communities' health, safety, and wellbeing as it supports reducing the effects of reverse sensitivity.			
S43.7	KiwiRail	CMU-01	Retain UFD-CM-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-01 as notified are recommended.	No
S58.29	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CMU-01	Retain CMU-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-01 as notified are recommended.	No
S64.9	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CMU-01	Retain CMU-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-01 as notified are recommended.	No
S58.30	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CMU-02	Retain CMU-02 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-02 as notified are recommended.	No
S50.10	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	CMU-03	Amend CMU-03 to include a clause that includes reference to 'well serviced by existing or planned public and active transport'. See submission for specific amendments requested.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington considers that it is unclear how UHCC have identified and applied walkable catchments in its district. The 10-minute walkable catchment approach differs from other TAs in the Greater Wellington region.	Accept	Submission point S50.10 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S58.21	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CMU-03	Retain CMU-03 as notified.	Accept in part	The submitter's support for CMU-03 is acknowledged, however an amendment is recommended in response to submission	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					point S50.10 – Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency.	
S58.22	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CMU-O4	Delete reference to 'Silverstream' in CMU-O4.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S64.10	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CM-O4	Amend CMU-O4 to provide for residential activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.23	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CMU-O5	Retain CMU-O5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-O5 as notified are recommended.	No
S64.11	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CM-O5	Retain CMU-O5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CMU-O5 as notified are recommended.	No
S64.5	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	UFD-OX – New objective	Insert a new objective that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population as follows: <u>UFD-Ox Ageing population: Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S63.1	Alex Stopforth	MDRS	Council should consider specific rules stating that a three storey residential building cannot be built with any of its living, or dining spaces (indoor or outdoor) adjacent to or overlooking any neighbour's living, dining or outdoor spaces such as lawns, gardens or patios (but not driveways, or garages). I don't know if this conflicts with the new medium density standards but presume it's possible to develop some additional	Reject	Although the submitter's concerns are acknowledged, the specific rules requested by the submitter would conflict with the MDRS.  The Council can only reduce the applicability of the MDRS density standards to the degree necessary to provide for qualifying matters (see Sections 77G(6) and 77I of the RMA). No justification to support	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			rules like this which preserve privacy while not interfering with the new medium density standards.		the submitter's requested provisions via qualifying matters has been identified.	
S27.23	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-O2	Retain Objective GRZ-O2 as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S56.19	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-O2	GRZ-O2 Well-functioning Urban Environments - Retain as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S58.98	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-O2	Retain GRZ-O2 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-O2 as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same reasons given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.22	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-O2	Retain GRZ-O2 as written.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S27.24	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-O3	Retain Objective GRZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S28.4	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	GRZ-O3	Amend Objective GRZ-O3 as follows: GRZ-O3 Housing Variety A <del>relevant residential zone</del> <u>The general residential zone</u> provides for a variety of housing types, <u>households</u> , and sizes that respond to: a. Housing needs and demands; and b. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3- storey buildings.	Reject	GRZ-O3 is a mandatory objective that is required to be incorporated into the GRZ pursuant to section 77G of the Act. The Council does not have the discretion to make the requested changes to GRZ-O3.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.99	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-O3	Retain GRZ-O3 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-O3 as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same reasons given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.23	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-O3	Retain GRZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S27.25	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-P1A	Amend Policy GRZ-P1A as follows: "Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the Zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments, <u>while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying area provisions.</u> "	Reject	GRZ-P1A is a mandatory policy that is required to be incorporated into the GRZ pursuant to section 77G of the Act. The Council does not have the discretion to make changes to GRZ-P1A.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as it not considered necessary to aid plan implementation and interpretation.	Accept	Submission point S27.25 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  NZDF supports the reference to qualifying matter areas in this policy. This would provide a pathway for controls to be incorporated to cater for reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	Submission point S27.25 is recommended for rejection on the grounds the Council does not have the discretion to make changes to this MDRS policy.	N/A
S28.5	Ara Poutama Aotearoa –	GRZ-P1A	Amend Policy GRZ-P1A as follows: GRZ-P1A Enable a variety of housing types	Reject	GRZ-P1A is a mandatory policy that is required to be incorporated into the GRZ	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Department of Corrections		and households with a mix of densities within the General Residential Zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.		pursuant to section 77G of the Act. The Council does not have the discretion to make changes to GRZ-P1A.	
S58.101	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P1A	Retain GRZ-P1A as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-P1A as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same reasons as those given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.24	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P1A	Retain GRZ-P1A as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S27.26	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-P1B	Retain Policy GRZ-P1B as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S41.33	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRZ-P1B and HRZ-P1	Retain the inclusion of GRZ-P1B and HRZ-P1 including historic heritage as a qualifying matter.  Include a schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori in the IPI.	Accept in part	See body of report.	No
S58.102	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P1B	Retain xGRZ-P1B as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-P1B as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same reasons given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.25	Retirement Villages	GRZ-P1B	Retain GRZ-P1B as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Association of New Zealand					
S72.27	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc – (LATE SUBMISSION)	GRZ-P1B and HRZ-P1	GRZ-P1B and HRZ-P1 - Identify sites of significance to Māori in the plan.	Reject	The identification of sites of significance to Māori in the plan requires an evidence base and consultation with affected property owners. This would be best addressed by the Council via a specific Schedule 1 RMA process - working in partnership with mana whenua.	No
S58.103	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P1C	Retain GRZ-P1C as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-P1C as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same reasons as those given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.26	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P1C	Retain GRZ-P1C as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S58.104	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P1D	Retain GRZ-P1D as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-P1D as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same reasons as those given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.27	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P1D	Retain GRZ-P1D as notified.	Accept	Retention as notified is consistent with the requirements of section 77G of the Act.	No
S58.111	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R2	Retain GRZ-R2 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	Retention of GRZ-R2 as notified is recommended, however it is not recommended to change the provision reference from GRZ to MRZ for the same	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					reasons as those given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	
S58.114	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S3	Retain GRZ-S3 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain GRZ-S3 as notified. However, it is not recommended to change the reference from GRZ to MRZ for the reasons specified under S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.37	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S3	Retain GRZ-S3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to GRZ-S3 as notified are recommended.	No
S56.23	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-S4	Add advice note to GRZ-S4: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	No
S58.115	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S4	Retain GRZ-S4 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-S4 as notified are recommended.  It is recommended the request to rename the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons given for submission points S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.38	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S4	Retain GRZ-S4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to GRZ-S4 as notified are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S56.24	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-S5	GRZ-S5 Outdoor living space Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/ granted.</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	No
S58.116	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S5	Delete MDRS standard GRZ-S5 and replace it with a standard that requires less outdoor living space (per unit). See the submission for the requested replacement standard.	Reject	Although it is possible to provide an outdoor living space standard that is more lenient than the MDRS outdoor living space standard, there is no evidence to suggest the MDRS standard is inappropriate for the General Residential Zone.	No
S64.39	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S5	Amend GRZ-S5 as follows: ... 3. For retirement units, clauses 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications: <u>a. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S20.1	Andrew Knight	GRZ	Allow three dwellings - each up to TWO storeys - on each site in the residential zone without needing resource consent.	Reject	The Council is required to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards into all relevant residential zones pursuant to	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>section 77G of the RMA. This includes the 11 metre permitted height density standard.</p> <p>The Council may reduce the application of the medium density residential standards to the degree necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter as provided for by section 77I of the RMA. Other than the existing qualifying matters included in the IPI, no other qualifying matters are proposed.</p>	
S58.117	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S7	Amend MDRS standard GRZ-S7 to apply a building height of '18m where located in proximity to an identified Local Centre Zone, as identified on the Planning Maps as a Height Variation Control'. See the submission for requested amendments.	Reject	The most appropriate building height and density of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services within the General Residential Zone adjacent to Local Centre Zone is considered to be as per the MDRS. It is important to note the permitted height under GRZ-S7 may be exceeded via a restricted discretionary activity resource consent. This enables a case-by-case consideration of the effects of the potential increase in height, and is considered to be the most appropriate method to achieve the objectives of the IPI.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The RVA supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the NP-SUD.	Reject	Submission point S58.117 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Reject	Submission point S58.117 is recommended for rejection.	
S64.40	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S7	Retain GRZ-S7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to GRZ-S7 as notified.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.118	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S8	Amend MDRS standard GRZ-S8 to add the following standard: ' <u>For sites identified as being subject to an increase in height control around the Local Centre Zones, a 60° recession plane measured from a point 6m vertically above ground level for the first 22m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage, and 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level where located further than 22m from the road and along all other boundaries.</u> '	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The RVA supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the NP-SUD.	Reject	Submission point S58.118 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Reject	Submission point S58.118 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S64.41	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S8	Amend GRZ-S8 as follows: .....c. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between two buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed: <u>d. Boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, rural zones, commercial and mixed use zones, industrial zones and special purpose zones.</u>	Reject	Height envelope encroachments have the potential to result in adverse effects on persons and activities carried out within the zones listed by the submitter. It is therefore not considered appropriate to exclude boundaries adjoining these zones from having to comply with the height in relation to boundary standard.	No
S58.119	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S13	Retain GRZ-S13 as notified with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-S13 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	
S64.43	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S13	Retain GRZ-S13 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to GRZ-S13 as notified are recommended.	No
S58.120	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S14	Retain GRZ-S14 as notified with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-S14 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.44	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S14	Amend GRZ-S14 as follows: <u>1. ... 10. For retirement units, clauses 1 – 9 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u>	Reject	It is considered the outlook space for residential units within a retirement village should be subject to the same minimum dimensions as all other residential units. As retirement villages require a resource consent within the GRZ, any requests to reduce the minimum outlook space per residential unit within a retirement village can be considered on a case-by-case basis as part of the resource consent process.	No
S58.121	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S15	Retain GRZ-S15 as notified with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-S15 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	
S64.45	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S15	Amend GRZ-S15 as follow: (a) Any retirement unit <u>or retirement unit</u> facing <del>the</del> <u>a public</u> street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.	Reject	Standard GRZ-S15 is the Windows to Street MDRS standard for all residential units facing the street. The standard does not refer to retirement units.  GRZ-S15 is a mandatory standard which the Council does not have the discretion to change.	No
S58.122	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-S16	Retain GRZ-S16 as notified with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-S16 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.46	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-S16	Amend GRZ-S16 as follows: 1. A residential unit or retirement unit at ground floor level has a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. 2. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit.	Reject	GRZ-S16 is a mandatory standard which the Council does not have the discretion to change.	No
S56.26	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R12, GRZ-R12A, GRZ-R12B	Add a new rule as follows: <u>GRZ-RX Emergency Service Facility</u> <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u>	Reject	Emergency service facilities are provided for within the General Residential Zone via discretionary activity Rule GRZ-R21 (not part of the IPI).	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the anticipated character and amenity values of the General Residential Zone.</u></li> <li>2. <u>The effects of the activity on the existing and anticipated function and role of the General Residential Zone.</u></li> <li>3. <u>The potential of the activity to compromise other activities that are enabled in the General Residential Zone.</u></li> <li>4. <u>The extent to which the adverse effects of the activity can be avoided, or appropriately remedied or mitigated.</u></li> <li>5. <u>The functional need or operational need for the emergency service facility to be located in the General Residential Zone.</u></li> </ol>		<p>It is considered appropriate for the Council to retain full discretion over the potential establishment of emergency service facilities within the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>It is considered the potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising in the future for emergency service facilities within the General Residential Zone will increase as the residential intensification enabled by the IPI is realised.</p>	
S58.127	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12	Amend GRZ-R12 to include a non-notification clause for public or limited notification is a proposal does not comply with GRZ-S5 - Outdoor living space (per residential unit), GRZ-S9 - Hydraulic neutrality, GRZ-S14 - Outlook space (per residential unit), GRZ-S15 (Windows to street), or GRZ-S16 (Landscaped area). See the submission for requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:	Accept	Submission S58.127 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			NZDF is not supportive of non-notification clauses for GRZ-R11, GRZ-R12, and GRZ-R12B.			
S58.128	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12	<p>Amend GRZ-R12 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete Matter of Discretion 1 and replace it with 'the scale form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood. (Note: this requested decision was not included in under this submission point in the summary of submission – however many submission points seeking a similar outcome are addressed throughout this table).</li> <li>2. Delete Matter of Discretion (2) and replace it with 'the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape'.</li> <li>3. Amend Matter of Discretion (3) by adding 'extent and' to the matter.</li> <li>4. Delete Matter of Discretion (4) and replace it with 'the extent and effects of the development to deliver quality on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale'.</li> <li>5. Delete Matter of Discretion (5) and replace it with a reference to the extent and effects on three waters capacity - see the submission for the requested amendments. See</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>All requested relief under this submission point is recommended for rejection.</p> <p>Reasons and comments on each of the specific requested amendments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The requested deletion of reference to the Medium and High Density Design Guide under Matter of Discretion 1 is recommended for rejection. It is recommended reference to the design guide is retained throughout the District Plan. There are many other specific submission points raised by the submitter that seek the deletion of the design guide. All specific requests are addressed individually under the relevant submission points. This recommendation is consistent with recommendation to reject the requested relief to remove the design guide from the District Plan and treat it as non-regulatory advice.</li> <li>2. The requested amendment to delete Matter of Discretion (2) and replace it with '<i>the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape</i>' simply repeats the mandatory MDRS policy incorporated into Policy GRZ-P1A. The requested amendment specifies a desired outcome from the policy, and is not considered to be an effective matter of</li> </ol>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			submission for requested amendments.		<p>discretion to be applied in the consideration of a resource consent. It is noted Section 104(1)(b)(vi) of the RMA already requires the Council to have regard to Policy GRZ-P1A when considering an application for resource consent. The requested amendment is therefore recommended for rejection.</p> <p>3. The request to amend Matter of Discretion 3 by adding '<i>extent and</i>' is unnecessary. It is noted the Council's discretion whether to consider the extent of breaches of permitted standards is already given to the Council pursuant to Sections 95D(b), 95E(2), and 104(2) of the RMA. These provisions enable the Council to disregard effects if a rule in the District Plan permits an activity with those effects (i.e. the permitted baseline).</p> <p>4. The requested deletion of 'cumulative effects' from Matter of Discretion 4 and its replacement with '<i>The extent and effects of the development to deliver quality on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale</i>' is not necessary as it is recommended to retain the Medium and High Density Design Guide within the District Plan, and retain it as a matter of discretion. The submitter's requested relief, and similar relief would be better addressed via amendments to policies, and this is addressed elsewhere in this table where relevant.</p> <p>5. The requested deletion of reference to the Council's Code of Practice for Civil</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>Engineering Works, and replacing it with 'The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, including that the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development' only captures some of the matters addressed within the Council's Code of Practice. On this basis the requested relief is inappropriate as it would remove the Council's discretion to consider and impose engineering conditions on all other civil engineering matters under the Code during the consideration of a resource consent – such as electrical power, gas, telecommunications and information cabling, land transport, earthworks, street scape, traffic services and road signage, land clearance and associated works.</p>	
S33.10	Fuel Companies	GRZ-R12A	<p>Amend the Matters of Discretion under Rule GRZ-R12A as follows:</p> <p>Council will restrict its discretion to, and may impose conditions on: .....</p> <p>(2) Site layout</p> <p><del>(73)</del> The matters contained in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.</p> <p><del>(84)</del> Transport effects.</p> <p><del>(35)</del> Cumulative effects.</p> <p><u>(6) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u></p>	Accept in part	<p>It is agreed reverse sensitivity effects in general should be within the Council's matters of discretion for the consideration of resource consents that breach some of the standards listed in Rule GRZ-R12A – in particular GRZ-S4 – Setbacks. However, it is not considered necessary to include reference to lawfully established non-residential activities on account of the IPI definition for <i>reverse sensitivity</i> providing sufficient clarity on this matter.</p> <p>It is considered the management of reverse sensitivity effects falls under Section 80E(1)(b)(iii) as a related provision that is consequential on the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. The increased permitted</p>	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>development enabled by the MDRS and Policy 3 has the potential to increase the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>It is recommended to amend Rule GRZ-R12A by adding an additional matter of discretion as follows (Note: recommended minor corrections pursuant to Clause 16(2), Schedule 1 of the RMA are also recommended to the IPI as shown in red text - but are not included below:</p> <p><b><u>(6) Reverse sensitivity effects.</u></b></p>	
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.</p>	Accept in part	Submission point S33.10 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to / within residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.</p>	Reject	Submission S33.10 is recommended to be accepted in part. It is considered appropriate to include reverse sensitivity effects in general to the matters which the Council restricts its discretion under Rule GRZ-R12A.	N/A
S58.130	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12A	Amend GRZ-R12A by deleting matters of discretion (2), (3), (4), and (5) and replace with matters of discretion addressing: (2) the extent and effects of development to deliver quality on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale. (3) effects on three waters infrastructure. (4) contribution to safe	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			and attractive public realm and streetscape. (5) on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale. See the submission for specific requested amendments.			
S33.11	Fuel Companies	GRZ-R12B	Amend the Matters of Discretion under Rule GRZ-R12B as follows:  Council will restrict its discretion to.....  <u>(8) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to / within residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.	Reject	Submission S33.11 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S58.132	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12B	Amend GRZ-R12B by adding the following to the restriction on notification clause: An application for resource consent under this rule which does not comply with GRZ-S5, GRZ-S9, GRZ-S14, GRZS15 or GRZ-S16 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes the inclusion of a notification restriction as each proposal	Accept	Submission point S58.132 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			needs to assess and then provide appropriate methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport network. As the Road Controlling Authority for the state highway network and manager of the funding of the land transport system Waka Kotahi needs to be notified of proposals that may affect the transport network to ensure that a proposal contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.			
OPPOSED BY: FS12 - KiwiRail			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for developments that do not comply with prescribed standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.132 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>NZDF is not supportive of non-notification clauses for GRZ-R11, GRZ-R12, and GRZ-R12B.</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.132 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.132 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for and recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.			
	SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for and recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Reject	Submission point S58.132 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.133	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12B	Amend GRZ-R12B by: 1. Deleting matters of discretion (2), (3), (5), and (7) and replace with matters of discretion addressing: i the extent and effects of development to deliver quality on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale. ii effects on three waters infrastructure. iii contribution to safe and attractive public realm and streetscape. iv the extent and effects of development to deliver quality	Reject	The relevant matters of discretion of GRZ-R12B are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter of discretion (2) – Site layout and design.</li> <li>Matter of discretion (3) – The matters contained in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.</li> <li>Matter of discretion (4) - Consideration of the effects of the standard not met.</li> <li>Matters of discretion (5) – Transport effects.</li> <li>Matters of discretion (6) - Methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects.</li> <li>Matters of discretion (7) – Cumulative effects.</li> </ul>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Amend matter of discretion (4) by adding 'extent and'.</li> <li>3. Delete matter of discretion (6).</li> </ol> <p>See the submission for all requested amendments.</p>		<p>It is recommended this submission point be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The requested replacement matter of discretion <i>'the extent and effects of development to deliver quality on-site amenity and privacy that is appropriate for its scale'</i> covers elements that are addressed in the Medium and High Density Design Guide – such as privacy, sunlight access, and other components that can contribute towards amenity such as landscape treatment and safety. The requested matter of discretion is not necessary for the Council to consider and address the matters it contains.</li> <li>2. The Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works includes engineering requirements for many other engineering aspects of development – such as earthworks, servicing, road design etc. It would therefore be inappropriate to delete this as a matter of discretion and replace it with a matter of discretion that only refers to three-waters infrastructure.</li> <li>3. The contribution to a safe and attractive public realm is already addressed via Objective GRZ-O2 – Well-Functioning Urban Environments, and Policy GRZ-P1C – which incorporates the mandatory MDRS policy for attractive and safe streets and</li> </ol>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>public open spaces. It is not considered necessary to duplicate objectives and policies within matters of discretion.</p> <p>4. It is considered unnecessary to include reference to 'extent and' to matter of discretion (4), as the extent of non-compliance with a permitted standard would be considered as part of the consideration of the effects.</p> <p>5. Matter of discretion 6 is a general matter to enable the Council to consider and apply conditions requiring methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects. This is an important matter of discretion that is recommended to be retained.</p>	
S58.9	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ	<p>Rename the General Residential Zone as the 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</p> <p>Consequential amendments to incorporate the use of the term 'Medium Density Residential Zone' throughout the District Plan.</p>	Reject	The General Residential Zone is a 'relevant residential zone' under section 70G(1) of the RMA. Therefore, the MDRS must be incorporated into the GRZ provisions, however there is no requirement under the RMA or National Planning Standards for the Council to amend the name of the zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. It is noted the GRZ does not preclude more traditional lower density subdivision and development.	No
S58.95	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ	<p>Amend the GRZ-chapter to:</p> <p>1. Rename the General Residential Zone (GRZ) as the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDZ);</p>	Reject	The General Residential Zone is a 'relevant residential zone' under section 70G(1) of the RMA. Therefore, the MDRS must be incorporated into the GRZ provisions, however there is no requirement under the RMA or National Planning Standards for the	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			2. Make consequential changes throughout the District Plan to give effect to the relief sought.		Council to amend the name of the zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. It is noted the GRZ does not preclude more traditional lower density subdivision and development.	
S5.21	Bob Anker	GRZ-P1	Amend clause [GRZ-P1] to provide greater clarity and consistency.	Reject	Policies GRZ-P1 and GRZ-P1E have equal status – noting that Policy GRZ-P1E is a mandatory MDRS policy.  No conflict between these two policies has been identified.	No
S51.2	Ministry of Education	GRZ-P1	Amend Policy GRZ – P1: To provide for a range of building densities within the residential areas that are compatible in form and scale with the neighbourhood’s planned built form and character which takes into account the capacity of the infrastructure ( <u>including additional infrastructure</u> ).	Reject	It recommended to reject the requested addition of ' <i>including additional infrastructure</i> ' to Policy GRZ-P1 for the same reasons provided for the recommended rejection of submission point S51.1.  It is not recommended to introduce the term ' <i>additional infrastructure</i> ' into the IPI, as it not necessary to give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD in decision making. See submission point S51.1 for more details.	No
S56.21	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-P1	GRZ-P1 - Retain as notified.	Accept in part	Policy GRZ-P1 is recommended to be retained, however amendments are recommended in response to submission point S58.106.	No
S58.106	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P1	Amend GRZ-P1 to make explicit reference be made to the anticipated change to the planned urban built form, appearance, and amenity within the zone, consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.29	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P1	Amend GRZ-P1 as follows: To provide for a range of building densities within the residential areas that <u>respond to</u> are <del>compatible in form and scale</del> with the neighbourhood's planned built form and character <del>which takes into account the capacity of the infrastructure.</del>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S5.20	Bob Anker	GRZ-P1E	GRZ-P1E Provide greater clarity as to the type and range of developments envisaged.	Reject	The type and range of developments provided for in the GRZ can be identified by the rules and activity status of different developments and activities.	No
S58.105	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P1E	Retain GRZ-P1E as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-P1E as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.28	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P1E	Retain GRZ-P1E as notified.	Accept	No amendments to GRZ-P1E as notified are recommended.	No
S58.107	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P2	Amend GRZ-P2 to make explicit reference be made to the anticipated change to the planned urban built form, appearance, and amenity within the zone, consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.30	Retirement Villages	GRZ-P2	Amend GRZ-P2 as follows: To ensure that the scale, appearance and siting of buildings, structures and activities	Reject	The compatibility of building densities with the planned urban built form is considered to be a more appropriate term as it better	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Association of New Zealand		<del>respond to</del> are compatible in form and scale with the neighbourhood's planned built form and character.		provides for the consideration of restricted discretionary activities – noting that restricted discretionary activities within the GRZ that give effect to the IPI form part of the planned urban built form. The requested replacement of the term 'compatibility' with 'responds to' is considered to provide less direction to decision makers.	
S58.108	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P4	Retain GRZ-P4 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-P4 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S64.31	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P4	Delete GRZ-P4.	Reject	The amendments to this policy are consequential on giving effect to Policy 6(b) to ensure the policy GRZ-P4 is not contrary to the MDRS objectives and policies.  It is important to note that policy GRZ-P4 also applies to rules that manage activities that are not affected by the MDRS, such as the effects of earthworks. The IPI does not propose to remove the consideration of the effects on residential amenity due to earthworks that breach permitted standards.	No
S58.109	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P5	Amend GRZ-P5 to delete reference to 'pleasant'. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.32	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P5	Delete GRZ-P5.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S51.3	Ministry of Education	GRZ-P9	Policy GRZ – P9 To promote residential development with a high level of amenity and ensure that it has adequate access to infrastructural ( <u>including additional infrastructure</u> ) requirements, while recognising that amenity values develop and change over time.	Reject	It recommended to reject the requested addition of ' <i>including additional infrastructure</i> ' to Policy GRZ-P9 for the same reasons provided for the recommended rejection of submission point S51.1.  It is not recommended to introduce the term ' <i>additional infrastructure</i> ' into the IPI, as it not necessary to give effect to the requirements of the NPS-UD in decision making. See submission point S51.1 for more details.	No
S50.17	Waka Kotahi	GRZ-P9	Retain GRZ-P9 as notified.	Accept in part	GRZ-P9 is recommended for retention, however amendments are recommended in response to submission S58.110.	No
S56.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-P9	GRZ-P9 - Retain as notified.	Accept in part	GRZ-P9 is recommended for retention, however amendments are recommended in response to submission S58.110.	No
S58.110	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-P9	Amend GRZ-P9 to make explicit reference be made to the anticipated change to the planned urban built form within the zone, consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.33	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P9	Amend GRZ-P9 as follows: To promote <u>high-quality</u> residential development <del>with a high level of amenity</del> and ensure that it has adequate access to infrastructural requirements, while	Reject	The requested wording is considered to be less consistent with the direction of NPS-UD Policy 6. It is unclear how the term 'high quality' would be interpreted and implemented by decision makers.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			recognising that amenity values develop and change over time.			
S58.97	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-O1	Amend GRZ-O1 to delete reference to 'character and amenity values developing and changing over time' and replacing with similar wording that includes reference to the 'planned urban build form of the zone'. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT: The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and with the RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part	The partial support of FS14 is recommended to be accepted on the basis that submission point S58.97 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and with Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	The partial support of FS15 is recommended to be accepted on the basis that submission point S58.97 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S58.112	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R3	Retain GRZ-R3 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-S3 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S58.113	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R5A	Retain GRZ-R5A as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-R5A as notified are recommended, so this part of the	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	
S64.36	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-R5A	Seek to insert a new rule to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone GRZ-X Retirement Villages PER.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED* BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi * Note – the further submission states 'Support and seek amendment', however the further submission seeks submission point S64.36 be disallowed.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes retirement villages as a Permitted activity as they can have significant effect on the transport network, and therefore a full consideration of how such effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated is required through a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Accept	Submission S64.36 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S33.9	Fuel Companies	GRZ-R11	Amend the Matters of Discretion under Rule GRZ-R11 as follows: Council will restrict its discretion to, and may impose conditions on: ..... effects. (7) Effects on neighbourhood <del>character</del> and amenity. (8) Financial contributions. (9) The matters contained in the Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1. (10) measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects. (11) Cumulative effects. <u>(12) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to / within residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.</p>	Reject	Submission point S33.9 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.</p>	Accept in part	Submission point S33.9 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S56.25	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R11	<p>GRZ-R11 Buildings which do not comply with permitted activity standards - Amend as follows:</p> <p>Council will restrict its discretion to and may impose conditions on:</p> <p><u>x. the degree, extent and effects of the non-compliance with GRZ-S1 and GRZ-S10.</u></p>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.124	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R11	<p>Amend GRZ-R11 to include a non-notification clause as follows:</p> <p><u>'i. An application for resource consent under this rule which does not comply with GRZ-S4 and GRZ-S8 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>ii. An application for resource consent under this rule which does not comply with GRZ-S5, GRZ-S9, GRZ-S14, GRZS15 or GRZ-S16 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.'</u></p>	Reject	The public notification preclusion requirements under the MDRS (Clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the RMA) only apply to resource consent applications for residential units. Resource consent applications for buildings that are not residential units are not subject to the notification preclusion requirements of the MDRS. This is made clear by Rule GRZ-R11 specifying that the rule does not apply to residential units.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					It is recommended determinations on the public and limited notification of resource consent applications for buildings that fail to comply with one or more of the permitted standards remain the decision of the Council on a case-by-case basis under the relevant notification provisions of the RMA including Sections 95A - 95E.	
	OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  NZDF is not supportive of non-notification clauses for GRZ-R11, GRZ-R12, and GRZ-R12B.	Accept	Submission point S58.124 is recommended for rejection.  For the further submitters information, the notification preclusion clauses within Rules GRZ-R12 and GRZ-R12B are mandatory MDRS requirements under Clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.	N/A
	SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for and recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Reject	Submission point S58.124 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for and	Reject	Submission point S58.124 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.			
S58.125	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R11	Amend GRZ-R11 to include an exclusion for non-compliance with GRZ-R13 - Number of residential units. See submission for requested amendment.	Reject	<p>The rule does not apply to residential units – see exclusion at the bottom of the rule.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate for the Council to retain its discretion to make notification decisions under the RMA for activities under the rule. The Council is not required to limit its discretion to make notification decisions on a case-by-case basis for activities under GRZ-R11.</p> <p>All notification preclusion requirements of the MDRS (clause 5 of Schedule 3A) have been incorporated into relevant rules in the GRZ. Rule GRZ-R11 is not one of these rules).</p>	No
S64.35	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-R11 (note: incorrectly summarised as being relevant to GRZ-R3)	<p>Seek that GRZ-R11 is amended as follows: <u>(a) Council will restrict its discretion to, and may impose conditions on: ... (b) For the construction of buildings associated with a retirement village, council will restrict its discretion to, and may impose conditions on: 1) The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, GRZ-S5, GRZ-S7, GRZ-S8, GRZ-S14, GRZ-S15 and GRZS16. 2) The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; 3) The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; 4) The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance</u></p>	Reject	<p>It is not necessary to include specific matters of discretion within rule GRZ-R11 for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.</p> <p>Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the General Residential Zone as a discretionary activity under Rules GRZ-R21 and GRZ-R22.</p> <p>The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>effects associated with building length; 5) When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider: a) The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 6) The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village. Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with GRZ-S3, GRZ-S4, GRZ-S7 and GRZ-S8 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>		result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	
S58.134	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R22	Retain GRZ-R22 as notified, with the exception that the specific provision reference is changed from GRZ to MRZ.	Accept in part	No amendments to GRZ-R22 as notified are recommended, so this part of the submission is recommended for acceptance.  However, it is recommended the part of the submission requesting a change in name of the GRZ to MRZ be rejected for the same reasons as those given for submissions S58.9 and S58.95.	No
S58.135	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-MC1	Amend GRZ-MC1 to refer to 'planned built form' rather than 'planned built character'.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.136	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-MC2	Amend GRZ-MC2 to refer to 'planned urban built form and appearance' rather than 'planned urban built character'.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S56.5	Ministry of Education	New rule GRZ-R18	<p>New Provision:  <u>GRZ-R18 - Educational Facility Council will restrict its discretion to and impose conditions on</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Location of the proposed education facility.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Appearance and design of the buildings.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Transport safety and efficiency</u></li> <li>4. <u>Design and layout of car parking, loading, manoeuvring and access areas.</u></li> <li>5. <u>Provision of utilities and/or services.</u></li> <li>6. <u>Landscaping</u></li> <li>7. <u>Hours of operation.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Restriction on notification</u>  <u>Subject to sections 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c), 95A(4) and 95C of the Act, a resource consent application for an education facility will be precluded from public notification under section 95A, but limited notification of an application will be determined in accordance with section 95B.</u></p>	Reject	<p>New education facilities within the General Residential Zoen are provided for via discretionary activity rule GRZ-R21.</p> <p>Due to the potential effects of new education facilities in residential zones (such as transport effects), it is considered appropriate that new education facilities within residential zones continues to be provided for as an unrestricted discretionary activity, with the Council retaining the discretion to make notification decisions on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the RMA.</p> <p>It is also noted that as a requiring authority, the Minister has powers with respect to designations under Sections 168 – 186 of the RMA, and that these provisions do not place limits on the Council's discretion to notify notices of requirement for new education facilities within residential areas.</p>	No
S56.20	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ	<p>Add a new objective as follows:  <u>GRZ-OX Three Waters Infrastructure Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Integrated</u></li> <li>• <u>Effective</u></li> <li>• <u>Efficient</u></li> </ul>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Functional</u></li> <li>• <u>Safe</u></li> <li>• <u>Sustainable</u></li> <li>• <u>Resilient</u></li> </ul>			
S56.27	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ	<p>Add a new rule as follows:  <u>GRZ-RX Emergency Service Facility</u>  <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u>  3. <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the anticipated character and amenity values of the General Residential Zone</u>  4. <u>The effects of the activity on the existing and anticipated function and role of the General Residential Zone.</u>  5. <u>The potential of the activity to compromise other activities that are enabled in the General Residential Zone.</u>  6. <u>The extent to which the adverse effects of the activity can be avoided, or appropriately remedied or mitigated.</u>  7. <u>The functional need or operational need for the emergency service facility to be located in the General Residential Zone.</u></p>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S64.19	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ and HRZ -Policies	<p>Seek a new policy is added in the GRZ and HRZ zones as follows: <u>Changing communities: To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a</u></p>	Reject	It is considered objectives GRZ-O1, GRZ-O2, GRZ-O3, and policies GRZ policies GRZ-P1A, GRZ-P1D, GRZ-P1, and GRZ-P2 already provide comprehensive direction to decision makers on providing for the changing needs of people and communities, and recognising that amenity values will	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>		change and develop over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people and communities.	
S64.34	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	General Residential Zones - Policies	Seeks that a new policy is inserted as follows: <b>GRZ-PX Role of density standards</b> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject	The consideration of an effects baseline is at the discretion of the Council under Sections 95D(b), 95E(2), and 104(2) of the RMA.  It is at the discretion of the Council on a case-by-case basis whether to apply a permitted baseline during the consideration of a resource consent application. The requested policy is inappropriate, as the Council receives its powers to consider a permitted baseline is via the RMA, not via a policy in the District Plan.	No
S27.22	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-General Residential Zone	Amend the third sentence of the 'Background' as follows: "A mix of housing densities are provided for, with medium density housing enabled across the General Residential Zone by the incorporation of the Medium Density Residential Standards. <u>It is recognised that there are parts of the Zone where the permitted development height and density may be modified or limited by qualifying matters.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  NZDF considers that permitted activity densities may need to be modified in relation to qualifying matters and for this reason requests that the amendment suggested by Transpower is included.	Accept in part	Submission pointy S27.22 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S27.27	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-General Residential Zone Rules	Amend the General Residential Zone rules to include a new <u>District-wide table rule that states the following: "District-wide matters Each activity in the General Residential Zone must comply with all relevant rules and standards that relate to qualifying matter areas."</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: It not considered necessary to aid plan implementation and interpretation. Such qualifying matters will have relevant provisions and rule framework within the Plan. The proposed amendment adds little value, noting proposals have a range of districtwide rules to comply with, not just those relating to qualifying matters.	Reject	The recommended amendment that partially accepts submission S27.27 is consistent with all other zone chapters in the IPI. It is considered important and helpful that the rule table within the GRZ refers to qualifying matter areas.	N/A
S58.37	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-GEN	Inclusion of a non-notification preclusion statement for all Controlled and Restricted Discretionary Activity rules within the SUB-GEN - General Subdivision Chapter. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The notification clauses within the IPI are the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives. All mandatory notification preclusions required by clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the RMA (the MDRS) have been incorporated into the relevant provisions.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes the inclusion of a non-notification preclusion statement, as each proposal needs to assess and then provide appropriate methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport network. As the Road Controlling Authority for the state highway network and manager of the	Accept	Submission point S58.37 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			funding of the land transport system Waka Kotahi needs to be notified of proposals that may affect the transport network to ensure that a proposal contributes to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS12 - KiwiRail		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for developments that do not comply with prescribed standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.	Accept	Submission point S58.37 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.39	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES	Amend all Controlled and Restricted Discretionary Activity rules in SUB-RES-Subdivision in the General Residential Zone chapter to include a non-notification preclusion statement for all in this chapter. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The notification clauses within the IPI are the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives. All mandatory notification preclusions required by clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the RMA (the MDRS) have been incorporated into the relevant provisions.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Waka Kotahi opposes the inclusion of a non-notification preclusion statement, as each proposal needs to assess and	Accept	Submission point S58.39 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			then provide appropriate methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport network. As the Road Controlling Authority for the state highway network and manager of the funding of the land transport system Waka Kotahi needs to be notified of proposals that may affect the transport network to ensure that a proposal contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.			
OPPOSED BY: FS12 - KiwiRail			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for developments that do not comply with prescribed standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.39 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>NZDF is not supportive of non-notification provisions for the General Residential Zone chapter.</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.39 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.51	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES	Delete all policy references from within all SUB-RES rules.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S27.18	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Rules SUB-RES-R7, SUB-RES-R6, SUB-RES-R8, SUB-RES-R9 and SUB-RES-R10	Retain the cross references to Rule SUB-RES-7 in Rules SUB-RES-R6, SUB-RES-R8, SUB-RES-R9, SUB-RES-R10 as notified.	Accept	References to rule SUB-RES-R7 is recommended to be retained in the rules identified by the submitter as the rules are not within the scope of the IPI.	No
S58.58	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R8, SUB-RES-R9, and SUB-RES-R10	Amend SUB-RES-R8, SUB-RES-R9, and SUB-RES-R10 to: (1). Remove appearance and landscaping from the matters of discretion. (2). Remove reference to consent notices being used for restricting development. (3). Remove the outcome of consultation from the matters of discretion.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS12 - KiwiRail			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for developments that do not comply with prescribed standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the	Accept in part	It is recommended to accept submission S58.58 in part. It is noted no amendments are recommended to the provisions Further Submitter FS12 is concerned about.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>consenting process.</p> <p>It is also appropriate for consent notices to be used to restrict development to an identified building platform as potential effects will have been assessed based on a development in that location and consideration of effects or mitigation measures may be different based on development occurring on a different part of the site.</p>			
S58.59	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R11, SUB-RES-S7	Retain amendments to SUB-RES-R11, SUB-RES-S7, and Matters for Consideration that relate to comprehensive residential development as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to these provisions as notified.	No
S27.15	Transpower New Zealand Limited	SUB-RES-O2	Retain objective SUB-RES-O2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the objective are recommended.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>Support proposed Objective SUB-RES-O2, and particularly the inclusion of reference to people and communities' health, safety, and wellbeing. NZDF supports any provision that promotes the communities' health, safety, and wellbeing as it supports reducing the effects of reverse sensitivity.</p>	Accept	No amendments to the objective are recommended.	No
S56.6	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-O2	SUB-RES-O2 Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the objective are recommended.	No
S58.40	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-O2	SUB-RES-O2 Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the objective are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.41	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-O3	Retain SUB-RES-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the objective are recommended.	No
S58.42	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P1	Amend SUB-RES-P1 to delete reference to 'appearance' and replace 'planned built character of the area' with 'planned urban built form within the zone'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.43	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P2	Retain SUB-RES-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.44	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P3	Retain SUB-RES-P3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.45	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P4	Retain SUB-RES-P4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S56.7	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-P5	SUB-RES-P5 Retain as notified.	Reject	Support for SUB-RES-P5 is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to submission S58.46 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities.	No
S58.46	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P5	Amend SUB-RES-P5 to refer to the 'planned urban built form', and other minor amendments. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.47	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P6	Amend SUB-RES-P6 to refer specifically to subdivision. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.48	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P7	Delete SUB-RES-P7.	Reject	The policy is relevant to subdivision due to medium and high density subdivision layout and design being interlinked with the design and location of proposed residential units	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					and site layout. It is considered that for most medium and high density subdivisions, the proposed boundaries of allotments are made up, at least in part, of common walls between proposed residential units and allotments.	
S58.49	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P8	Delete SUB-RES-P8.	Reject	The policy is relevant to subdivision due to medium and high density subdivision layout and design being interlinked with the design and location of proposed residential units and site layout. It is considered that for most medium and high density subdivisions, the proposed boundaries of allotments are made up, at least in part, of common walls between proposed residential units and allotments.	No
S58.50	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P9	Delete SUB-RES-P9.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S56.8	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-R1	SUB-RES-R1 Subdivision within the General Residential Zone 2. B. Each residential unit complies with the following rules and standards: <del>(x) SUB-RES-SX</del>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.52	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R1	Amend SUB-RES-R1 to delete reference to 'appearance' and 'landscaping'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.53	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R2	Amend SUB-RES-R2 to delete reference to 'appearance' and 'landscaping'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S65.1	Stephen Pattinson	SUB-RES-R2.	General Residential Zone - subdivision under SUB-RES-R2. Proceed with the zone change in Pinehaven from	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the allotment sizes as notified.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	(late submission)		Residential Conservation to General Residential with consequent minimum lot sizes being reduced from 750m2 (front) and 900m2 (rear) to 400m2 for both front and rear lots.			
S56.11	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-R6	SUB-RES-R6 - Amend as follows: Subdivision that is not a controlled activity under rule SUB-RES-R1; and subdivision that does not comply with one or more of the standards under <u>SUB-RES-S1 (1) SUB-RES-S3, and SUB-RES-SX.</u> Council will restrict its discretion to, and may impose conditions on: ...	Reject	Rule SUB-RES-R6 is specifically for the management of proposed subdivision that will create one or more vacant allotments. This is consistent with the direction of clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the RMA – <i>Further rules about subdivision requirements</i> . It is not appropriate to include subdivision that does not comply with the access standards under this rule.  It is noted that the construction and layout of vehicular access is addressed under matter of discretion (4). In addition, existing district plan rule SUB-RES-R5 already manages subdivision that does not comply with the access requirements of SUB-RES-S3. This rule is not part of the IPI.  The new standard requested by the submitter (referred to as SUB-RES-SX) is recommended for acceptance in part under submission S56.10 within the 'Requested New Provisions' section below.	No
S58.56	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R6	Amend SUB-RES-R6 to remove appearance and landscaping from the matters of discretion.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.57	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R6	Amend SUB-RES-R6 to remove the outcome of consultation from the matters of discretion.	Reject	The retention of matters of discretion regarding the outcome of consultation with relevant network utility operators, or renewable electricity generation activities is an important resource management tool to ensure appropriate conditions are in place	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					to enable the approval of applications in some scenarios.	
	OPPOSED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi		<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Waka Kotahi opposes the removal of consultation requirements as each proposal needs to assess and then provide appropriate methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on the transport network. As the Road Controlling Authority for the state highway network and manager of the funding of the land transport system Waka Kotahi needs to be notified of proposals that may affect the transport network to ensure that a proposal contributes to and effective, efficient and safe land transport system.</p>	Accept	Submission points S58.57 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS12 - KiwiRail		<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for developments that do not comply with prescribed standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.</p>	Accept	Submission points S58.57 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION:  NZDF opposes removing regionally significant infrastructure (i.e defence facilities) as a matter of discretion, unless there is a rule framework addressing effects on significant infrastructure as stated in the submission.	Accept in part	Submission points S58.57 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.54	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-S1	Amend SUB-RES-S1 to delete the minimum site area threshold, and to add a shape factor of 8m x 15m for vacant allotments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S56.9	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-S3	SUB-RES-S3 Access standards for subdivision - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to SUB-RES-S3.	No
S58.55	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-S3	Retain SUB-RES-S3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to SUB-RES-S3.	No
S53.13	New Zealand Defence Force	SUB-RES-MC1	Amend clause (6) of Policy SUB-RES-MC1 to include Trentham Military Camp.	Accept in part	There is potential for reverse sensitivity effects as a resource management issue for Trentham Military Camp.	No
S56.5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New SUB-GEN objective	New objective and policy: <u>SUB-GEN-OX Three Waters Infrastructure</u> <u>Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u> <u>Integrated, Effective, Efficient, Functional, Safe, Sustainable, Resilient</u> <u>SUB-GEN-PX Three Waters Servicing</u> (a) <u>All subdivision and development provide integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level</u>	Reject	The requested new objective and policy do not provide sufficient direction or a clear method on how the objective could be achieved.  Three waters infrastructure provisions and requirements are already in place via subdivision and permitted activity building rules and standards.  It is the role of financial contributions (or development contributions) and infrastructure management planning under	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>that is appropriate to their location and intended use.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term, then avoid further intensification until constraints are resolved.</u></p>		<p>the Local Government Act 2002 to address any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity and funding.</p> <p>It is considered the level of permitted activity development enabled by the IPI (as required by the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD) conflicts with the requested policy direction – particularly clause b). with respect to <i>avoiding</i> intensification.</p>	
S56.10	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New SUB-RES standard	<p>Add a new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>SUB-RES-SX</u></p> <p><u>Water supply, stormwater, and wastewater</u></p> <p><u>1. All activities shall comply with the water supply (including firefighting water supply), stormwater and wastewater standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.</u></p>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S4.1	Grant Foster	Medium and High density residential	Rejection of any 3+ storey buildings within pre-existing neighbourhoods. A new and more considered approach to development within the city and working closer with developers to buy, build and develop blocks of land as opposed to single titles.	Reject	The Council is required by NPS-UD Policy 3(c)(i) and (ii) to enable building heights of at least six stories within a walkable catchment of the City Centre Zone and the passenger rail stations within the City. This walkable catchment is the extent of the proposed High Density Residential Zone.	No
S5.22	Bob Anker	HRZ chapter	Amend [HRZ description] to make the document consistent.	Reject	It is unclear what specific amendments the submission point is requesting to the HRZ description. The submitter may wish to provide more information at the hearing to enable the consideration of specific amendments.	No
S12.1	James Bade	High Density Residential Zone	Exempt the area bounded by Benzie Ave, Palfrey St, Brown St, and Martin St from high density housing to protect the	Reject	The area bounded by Benzie Avenue, Palfrey Street, Brown Street and Martin Street is within a walkable catchment of the	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			heritage of that area and maintain it as a key pleasant residential area close to the CBD.		City Centre Zone and the Upper Hutt rail station. Therefore, the district plan is required to enable building heights of at least 6 stories pursuant to policy 3(c)(i) and (ii) of the NPS-UD.  No matters have been identified in the area that would justify the application of any additional qualifying matters pursuant to section 771 of the RMA.	
S46.21	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	High Density Residential Zone	BMC is actively planning future development for the balance of the site and is seeking to ensure that the District Plan provides for sufficient building heights and density of urban form, as required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD). If the structure plan intends that duplexes and terrace housing units are provided in the area, then reference to residential above ground level should be removed.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S50.18	Waka Kotahi	HRZ-O4, HRZ-P6, and HRZ-P7	Retain HRZ-O4, HRZ-P6, and HRZ-P7 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment is recommended to HRZ-P6 in as a consequential amendment in response to submission S5.26 – Bob Anker	No
S58.138	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ chapter	Rewrite the HRZ chapter to remove the need for compliance with the permitted activity rules and standards that apply to the GRZ.	Reject	The structure of the HRZ and its link to the GRZ provisions provides an efficient method to manage activities within the HRZ chapter in the same way as provided for in the GRZ without the need to duplicate all the relevant GRZ provisions in the HRZ chapter.	No
S58.139	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ chapter	Amend the HRZ chapter by inserting the HRZ rules and standards into this chapter, as detailed in Appendix 2 of the	Reject	The submission does not include any analysis or justification that the requested new rules and standards offer a more	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			submission. See Appendix 2 of the submission for details.		appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives of the IPI.  The structure of the HRZ and its link to the GRZ provisions provides an efficient method to manage activities within the HRZ chapter in the same way as provided for in the GRZ without the need to duplicate all the relevant GRZ provisions in the HRZ chapter.	
S58.152	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ	Rewrite all HRZ rules to remove the need for reference to the GRZ chapter. The HRZ should contain all rules, standards, matters of discretion and information requirements necessary to determine the activity status of an activity occurring in the HRZ.	Reject	The structure of the HRZ and its link to the GRZ provisions provides an efficient method to manage activities within the HRZ chapter in the same way as provided for in the GRZ without the need to duplicate all the relevant GRZ provisions in the HRZ chapter. The HRZ provisions contain all the relevant rules, standards, matters of discretion, and information requirement for all activities that area managed differently to how they are managed in the GRZ. All other provisions are identical between the two zones, hence the proposed cross-reference structure.	No
S64.47	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	High Density Residential Zone – Background Text	Retain background text for high density zones as notified.	Accept in part	Support for the background text as notified is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S56.28	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HRZ-O1	HRZ-O1 Well-functioning Urban Environments - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O1.	No
S58.141	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-O1	Retain HRZ-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O1.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.48	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-O1	Retain HRZ-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O1.	No
S72.1	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (LATE SUBMISSION)	HRZ-O1	HRZ-O1 Well-functioning urban environments - Re-craft the objective HRZ-O1 to reflect environmental wellbeing in the drafting.	Reject	Although it is agreed the objective is deficient with respect to including environmental consideration as a component of sustainable management as described in Section 5 of the RMA, the objective is a mandatory provision the Council is required to include within the HRZ without modification in accordance with clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.	No
S5.23	Bob Anker	HRZ-O2	Amend the clause [HRZ-O2] to show the correct height specification.	Reject	It is acknowledged the reference to 3-storey buildings does not fit well within an objective for the High Density Residential Zone where at least 6-stories must be provided for, the objective is a mandatory provision the Council is required to include within the HRZ without modification in accordance with clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.	No
S28.6	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	HRZ-O2	Amend Objective HRZ-O2 as follows: HRZ-O2 Housing Variety A <del>relevant residential zone</del> <u>The high density residential zone</u> provides for a variety of housing types, <u>households</u> , and sizes that respond to a. Housing needs and demands; and b. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3- storey buildings.	Reject	The objective is a mandatory provision the Council is required to include within the HRZ without modification in accordance with clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.	No
S58.142	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-O2	Retain HRZ-O2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O2.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.49	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-O2	Retain HRZ-O2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O2.	No
S72.2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	HRZ-O2	HRZ-O2 Housing Variety - Reword the objective to expand and specify Housing Variety also includes Papakāinga and that the clause (b) is not supposed to limit Tangata Whenua's right to Papakāinga and cannot be held as a reason for proposing Papakāinga.	Reject	The objective is a mandatory provision the Council is required to include within the HRZ without modification in accordance with clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.  It is noted district-wide provisions for Papakāinga are included within the recommended PK-Papakāinga chapter.	No
S51.6	Ministry of Education	HRZ-O4	Objective HRZ – O4 The planned built urban form of the High Density Residential Zone includes high density residential development of heights and densities of urban form greater than that provided for in the General Residential Zone <u>whilst ensuring that it has adequate access to infrastructural (including additional infrastructure) requirements.</u>	Reject	Provisions that require adequate access to infrastructure are provided for by other chapters and matters of discretion within specific rules for subdivision and development.  The requested reference to 'additional infrastructure' is recommended for rejection under other submission points.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as infrastructure is adequately addressed elsewhere in the proposed IPI. If specific reference to educational facilities is required, this could be a separate objective or policy.	Accept	Submission S51.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as infrastructure is adequately addressed elsewhere in the proposed IPI. If specific reference to	Accept	Submission point S51.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			educational facilities are required, this could be a separate objective or policy.			
S58.144	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-O4	Retain HRZ-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O4.	No
S64.51	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-O4	Retain HRZ-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-O4.	No
S35.5	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	GRZ-P1 and HRZ-P1	Should Council consider the ISPP process unable to adopt the sought relief, WELL alternatively seeks that the permitted activity performance standards contained within the IPI for Medium and High Density housing include reference to the potential effects of Regionally Significant Infrastructure, in particular linking the provisions to Proposed Policy GRZ-P1B and HRZ-P1 of the ODP – and to amend the Policies as follows (additional text underlined): <i>Apply the MDRS across all relevant residential zones in the district plan except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as significant natural areas, <u>Regionally Significant Infrastructure</u>, historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).</i>	Reject	HRZ-P1 and GRZ-P1B incorporate mandatory MDRS policies. It is considered that the Council does not have the discretion to change the wording of these policies. It is noted that qualifying matters do apply to existing provisions that manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on regionally significant infrastructure.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:	Accept	Submission point S35.5 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management.			
S58.145	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P1	Retain HRZ-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-P1.	No
S64.52	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P1	Retain HRZ-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-P1.	No
S64.53	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P2	Retain HRZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-P2.	No
S58.146	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P2	Retain HRZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-P2.	No
S64.54	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P3	Retain HRZ-P3 as notified.	Accept	HRZ-P3 is a mandatory MDRS policy that must be inserted into all relevant residential zone provisions pursuant to section 77G(1) of the RMA. No amendments to HRZ-P3 are recommended.	No
S58.147	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P3	Retain HRZ-P3 as notified.	Accept	HRZ-P3 is a mandatory MDRS policy that must be inserted into all relevant residential zone provisions pursuant to section 77G(1) of the RMA. No amendments to HRZ-P3 are recommended.	No
S72.5	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	HRZ-P3	HRZ-P3 - Reword the policy to put some substance around the day-to-day and	Reject	HRZ-P3 is a mandatory MDRS policy that must be inserted into all relevant residential zone provisions pursuant to section 77G(1)	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	(late submission)		reword to expand on the wellbeing as it speaks to day-today needs also.		of the RMA. No amendments to HRZ-P3 are recommended.	
S64.55	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P4	Retain HRZ-P4 as notified.	Accept	HRZ-P4 is a mandatory MDRS policy that must be inserted into all relevant residential zone provisions pursuant to section 77G(1) of the RMA. No amendments to HRZ-P4 are recommended.	No
S58.148	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P4	Retain HRZ-P4 as notified.	Accept	HRZ-P4 is a mandatory MDRS policy that must be inserted into all relevant residential zone provisions pursuant to section 77G(1) of the RMA. No amendments to HRZ-P4 are recommended.	No
S72.6	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	HRZ-P4	HRZ-P4 - Delete current wording and insert: Provide for developments that achieve high quality design and environmental objectives.	Reject	HRZ-P4 is a mandatory MDRS policy that must be inserted into all relevant residential zone provisions pursuant to section 77G(1) of the RMA. No amendments to HRZ-P4 are recommended.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the MDRS.	Accept	Submission point S72.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the MDRS.	Accept	Submission point S72.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.149	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P5	Amend HRZ-P5 to refer to 'planned urban built form, appearance, and amenity' rather than 'planned built character'. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.56	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P5	Amend HRZ-P5 as follows: To provide for a range of building densities within the residential areas that <u>respond to are compatible in form and scale</u> with the neighbourhood's planned built character.	Reject	The requested wording is not considered to provide a greater level of direction to decision makers than the existing wording, and in particular as recommended to be amended in response to submission point S58.149 above.	No
S33.12	Fuel Companies	HRZ-P6	Amend Policy HRZ-P6 as follows:  Provide for and encourage medium and high density residential development <del>that is consistent with the Council's Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1</del> <u>that achieves a built form that contributes to high-quality built environment outcomes including by:</u>  (i) <u>Requiring designs to be consistent with Council's Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1;</u> <u>and</u> (ii) <u>Minimising reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	The Council is required to enable building heights of at least 6 stories within the HRZ. The purpose of Policy HRZ-P6 is to provide policy direction for the consideration and application of the Medium and High Density Design Guide.  It is considered addressing potential reverse sensitivity effects is an important resource management issue due to the significant increase in permitted development the IPI is required to enable within relevant residential zones. Therefore, it is recommended in response to other submission points to include <i>reverse sensitivity effects</i> as a matter of discretion to the HRZ rules.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management. Kāinga Ora opposes design guides being incorporated as statutory elements of the District Plan.	Accept	Submission point S33.12 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.	Reject	Submission point S33.12 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S64.57	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P6	Seek that retirement villages are expressly excluded from having to apply Council's Medium and High Density Design Guide.	Reject	Retirement villages are a discretionary activity within the HRZ under rule GRZ-R21. Therefore, the Council's discretion is not restricted to specifically listed matters when considering a resource consent application for a retirement village within the HRZ.  Should any part of a retirement village front a public road, it may be appropriate to consider the design outcomes sought by the design guide. However, this is best considered on a case-by-case basis that takes into account the specific characteristics of a retirement village proposal on a specific site within the HRZ.	No
S64.58	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-P7	Retain HRZ-P7 as notified.	Accept in part	A consequential amendment is recommended to HRZ-P7 to correct the permitted height in the HRZ in response to submission point S5.26 – Bob Anker.	No
S43.11	KiwiRail	HRZ-R1	Retain HRZ-R1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-R1.	No
S56.29	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HRZ-R1, HRZ-R3, HRZ-R4, HRZ-S1	HRZ-R1, HRZ-R3, HRZ-R4, HRZ-S1 - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-R1.	No
S64.59	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-R1	Amend as shown below: Where: a. Compliance is achieved with all permitted activity rules and standards that apply to the General Residential	Reject	The requested amendments are unnecessary as HRZ-R1 specifies:  <i>All permitted activity rules, standards, matters, and information requirements</i>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Zone <u>(excluding building height, height in relation to boundary, and building coverage).</u>		<p><i>that apply to the <b>General Residential Zone</b> except as specifically provided for in this table.</i></p> <p><i>Should there be any conflict between the <b>High Density Residential Zone</b> and the <b>General Residential Zone</b> provisions, the provisions of the <b>High Density Residential Zone</b> prevail.</i></p> <p>The existing wording of HRZ-R1 provides flexibility in the event IPI recommendations are made to add additional density standards to the HRZ chapter that are more lenient than those provided for the GRZ.</p>	
S58.153	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R2	<p>Amend HRZ-R2 to include the following non-notification clauses: Restriction on notification:</p> <p>iii. An application for resource consent under this rule which does not comply with HRZ-S3 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>iv. An application for resource consent under this rule which does not comply with HRZ-S5 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p>Insert a new restricted discretionary activity and discretionary activity rules into the HRZ chapter for commercial activities on ground floor of residential areas. Requested new rules include limits on GFA, hours of operation, and matters of discretion covering design, appearance and siting of the commercial</p>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			activity, noise and illumination, and signage. See the submission for specific requested amendments.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  NZDF is not supportive of non-notification clause for HRZ-R2.	Accept in part	Submission point S58.153 is recommended to be accepted in part – but only with respect to the restriction on the public notification of applications that fail to comply with either the height in relation to boundary, or the number of residential units permitted standards. Limited notification is not recommended to be restricted.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION IN PART:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	The partial support of the submitter is recommended to be partially accepted, on the basis that submission point S58.153 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION IN PART:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	The partial support of the submitter is recommended to be partially accepted, on the basis that submission point S58.153 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.60	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-R2	<p>Amend HRZ-R2 is as follows:</p> <p><u>....3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a) Compliance is not achieved with one or more of the standards under HRZ-R2.1.a, and the activity is for the construction of buildings associated with a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p>(1) <u>The effects arising from exceeding any of the following High Density Residential Zone standards: HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3 and HRZ-S4.</u></p> <p>(2) <u>The effects arising from exceeding any of the following General Residential Zone standards: GRZ-S4, GRZ-S5, GRZ-S14, GRZ-S15 and GRZ-S16.</u></p> <p>(3) <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>(4) <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>(5) <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p>(6) <u>When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider: (a) The need to provide</u></p>	Reject	<p>It is not necessary to include specific provisions within rule HRZ-R2 for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.</p> <p>Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare, and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the General Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone as a discretionary activity under Rules GRZ-R21 and GRZ-R22.</p> <p>The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>for efficient use of larger sites; and</u>  <u>(b) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>(7) <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4 and GRZ-S4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>			
S58.154	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R3	Rewrite HRZ-R3 to remove the need for compliance with the controlled activity rules, standards, matters and information requirements that apply to the GRZ.	Reject	It is considered the IPI structure where the HRZ provisions cross-reference to the GRZ provisions where the requirements are identical is an effective method to reduce plan complexity while retaining functionality for plan implementation.	No
S58.155	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R5	Rewrite HRZ-R5 to remove the need for compliance with the discretionary activity rules that apply to the GRZ.	Reject	It is considered the IPI structure where the HRZ provisions cross-reference to the GRZ provisions where the requirements are identical is an effective method to reduce plan complexity while retaining functionality for plan implementation.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.156	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R6	Rewrite HRZ-R6 to remove the need for compliance with the non-complying activity rules that apply to the GRZ.	Reject	It is considered the IPI structure where the HRZ provisions cross-reference to the GRZ provisions where the requirements are identical is an effective method to reduce plan complexity while retaining functionality for plan implementation.	No
S58.157	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R7	Rewrite HRZ-R7 to remove the need for compliance with the non-complying activity rules that apply to the GRZ.	Reject	It is considered the IPI structure where the HRZ provisions cross-reference to the GRZ provisions where the requirements are identical is an effective method to reduce plan complexity while retaining functionality for plan implementation.	No
S5.26	Bob Anker	HRZ-R8	Amend this clause [HRZ-R8].	Accept in part	See body of report.	No
S33.18	Fuel Companies	HRZ-R8	Amend Standard HRZ-S8 to include the following matter of discretion:  <u>(8) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	It is agreed reverse sensitivity effects in general should be within the Council's matters of discretion for the consideration of resource consents for buildings under rule HRZ-R8. However, rule HRZ-R8 is recommended for deletion in response to submission S58.170 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities. Rule HZR-R8 duplicated rule HRZ-R2.2, and is therefore surplus to requirements.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.	Accept	Submission point S33.18 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S33.13	Fuel Companies	HRZ-S1	Retain Standard HRZ-S1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to HRZ-S1.	No
S5.24	Bob Anker	HRZ-S2	Amend the document to ensure consistency.	Reject	It is unclear what specific amendments are being requested. Amendments are recommended in response to other submission points by submitter S5 – Bob Anker, and these may address the submitter's requested decision.	No
S33.14	Fuel Companies	HRZ-S2	Amend Standard HRZ-S2 as follows:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: ..... <u>(8) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes this additional matter of discretion as the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.	Reject	Submission point S33.14 is recommended for acceptance in part.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.	Accept in part	Submission S33.14 is recommended for acceptance in part.	N/A
S58.159	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S2	Amend HRZ-S2 to provide building heights of:  a. 22m; or	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>b. 43m within 0m to 400m of the City Centre Zone or rapid transit stops.</p> <p>c. 36m within 400m to 800m of the edge of the City Centre Zone or rapid transit stops.</p> <p>d. 29m within 0m to 800m of the edge of the Town Centre Zone</p>			
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD, subject to the relief sought in its primary submission.</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.159 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD, subject to the relief sought in its primary submission.</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.159 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.161	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S2	<p>Delete all HRZ-S2 Matters of Discretion and replace them with matters of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>a. Whether topographical or other site constraints make compliance with the standard impractical.</u></p> <p><u>b. Streetscape and visual amenity effects;</u></p> <p><u>c. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.</u> See the submission for the specific amendments sought.</p>	Reject	<p>The submitter's requested replacement matters of discretion are not considered to be superior to the notified version of HRZ-S2, as the requested amendments relate to matters that are already addressed in the Medium and High Density Design Guide.</p> <p>Note the submitter's requested decision to delete the Medium and High Density Design Guide and treat it as non-statutory guidance is recommended for rejection under multiple other submission points in the Design Guide section of this report.</p>	No
S64.61	Retirement Villages	HRZ-S2	<p>Amend HRZ-S2 the matters of discretion for HRZ-S2 to exclude retirement villages as follows:</p>	Reject	It is not recommended to provide specific provisions for buildings within retirement villages. Buildings within retirement villages	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Association of New Zealand		<p>...</p> <p>Matters of Discretion where Permitted Activity Standard(s) are not met.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. The matters contained in the Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1.</p> <p><u>7. For retirement villages, the matters of discretion under HRZ-R2(3)(a)(1)-(7) apply.</u></p>		<p>have the potential to result in the same effects as other buildings within the HRZ.</p> <p>Retirement villages within the HRZ are provided for via discretionary activity rule GRZ-R21. Taking into account the potential effects that could result from the scale and mix of uses within retirement villages within the HRZ, it is not considered appropriate to limit the Council's discretion for the consideration of new retirement villages.</p>	
S33.15	Fuel Companies	HRZ-S3	<p>Amend Standard HRZ-S3 to include the following matter of discretion:</p> <p><u>(7) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u></p>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora opposes this additional matter of discretion as the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.</p>	Reject	Submission point S33.15 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.</p>	Accept in part	Submission point S33.15 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.162	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S3	Amend HRZ-S3 as follows:  All buildings and structures must not project beyond a: a) <u>60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 22m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</u> b) <u>60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> c) <u>Except no part of any building or structure may project beyond a:</u> i. <u>60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along any boundary that adjoins a site in the Medium Density Residential Zone.</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Act.	Reject	Submission point S58.162 is recommended for rejection.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Act.	Reject	Submission point S58.162 is recommended for rejection.	No
S58.164	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S3	Delete all HRZ-S3 Matters of Discretion and replace them with the submitters requested matters of discretion as follows: <u>1. Dominance, privacy, and shading effects on adjoining sites.</u> See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.62	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-S3	Amend to exclude retirement villages as follows: (5). HRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary ... Matters of Discretion where Permitted Activity Standard(s) are not met. (a) Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... <u>(b) For retirement villages, the matters of discretion under HRZ-R2(3)(a)(1)-(7) apply.</u>	Reject	It is not recommended to provide specific provisions for buildings within retirement villages. Buildings within retirement villages have the potential to result in the same effects as other buildings within the HRZ.  Retirement villages within the HRZ are provided for via discretionary activity rule GRZ-R21. Taking into account the potential effects that could result from the scale and mix of uses within retirement villages within the HRZ, it is not considered appropriate to limit the Council's discretion for the consideration of new retirement villages.	No
S33.16	Fuel Companies	HRZ-S4	Amend Standard HRZ-S4 to include the following matter of discretion:  <u>(7) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.	Reject	Submission point S33.16 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.	Accept in part	Submission point S33.16 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.166	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S4	Delete all HRZ-S4 Matter of Discretion and replace them with the submitters requested matters of discretion as follows: <u>a. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; and</u> <u>b. Dominance effects on adjoining properties.</u> <u>c. Whether topographical or other site constraints make compliance with the standard impractical.</u> See the submission for requested amendments.	Reject	The submitter's requested replacement matters of discretion are not considered to be superior to the notified version of HRZ-S4, as the requested amendments relate to matters that are already addressed in the Medium and High Density Design Guide.  Note the submitter's requested decision to delete the Medium and High Density Design Guide and treat it as non-statutory guidance is recommended for rejection under multiple other submission points in the Design Guide section of this report.	No
S5.25	Bob Anker	HRZ-S5	Amend the document to ensure consistency.	Reject	The submission point does not appear to request any specific amendments to HRZ-S5. The submitter may wish to provide more information at the hearing to enable the consideration of specific requested amendments to HRZ-S5.	No
S33.17	Fuel Companies	HRZ-S5	Amend Standard HRZ-S5 to include the following matter of discretion:  <u>(7) Reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that the presence of existing lawfully established activities in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.	Reject	Submission point S33.17 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports this submission and considers it critical that reverse sensitivity effects are recognised and managed in relation to NZDF facilities.	Accept in part	Submission point S33.174 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.168	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S5	Delete all HRZ-S5 Matters of Discretion and replace with the submitter's requested matters of discretion as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u></li> <li>2. <u>The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape;</u></li> <li>3. <u>The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</u></li> <li>4. <u>The degree to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale; and</u></li> <li>5. <u>The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u></li> </ol>	Accept in part	It is considered appropriate to include a matter of discretion regarding the effects on infrastructure and services. All other requested amendments are recommended for rejection for the reasons specified in the report.	Yes
S58.169	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S5	Amend HRZ-S5 to as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide for building heights of 22m, or the following building heights within the</li> </ol>	Reject	It is considered that the most appropriate method to achieve the IPI objectives for the HRZ is to enable the case-by-case consideration of proposals for buildings that	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			specified walkable catchment of the CCZ or TCZ: a. CCZ i. 0m to 400m: 43m ii. 400m to 800m: 36m b. TCZ i. 0m to 800m: 29m		propose to exceed the permitted height standard. It is noted the submission does not demonstrate why the requested height increases are the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives, and why they are appropriate as permitted activity standards in the context of Upper Hutt City.	
S58.170	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R8 or HRZ-R2	Amend HRZ-R8 or HRZ-R2 so that there is only one Restricted Discretionary Activity rule assessing buildings exceeding the maximum permitted building height. Amend the maximum building height to be 22m.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S28.7	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	HRZ-P9	Add a new Policy HRZ-P9 as follows: <u>HRZ-P9 Enable a variety of housing types and households with a mix of densities within the General Residential Zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.</u>	Reject	The requested policy would duplicate the content of other HRZ provisions including HRZ-O2, and General Residential Zone provisions. It is noted the requested new policy refers to the General Residential Zone. The requested policy does not accurately reflect the planned built urban form of the High Density Residential Zone.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Kāinga Ora support recognising that there are different types of households within the urban environment. Kāinga Ora notes that the proposed wording of HRZ-P9 incorrectly references the 'General Residential Zone'.	Accept	Submission S28.7 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S51.7	Ministry of Education	HRZ-P9	HRZ New Policy: <u>HRZ – P9: Development is supported by educational facilities.</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S56.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New rule	Add a new rule as follows: <u>HRZ-RX Emergency Service Facility</u> <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u>	Reject	Emergency service facilities are provided for within the High Density Residential Zone via the General Residential Zone discretionary activity Rule GRZ-R21 (not part of the IPI).	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the anticipated character and amenity values of the High Density Residential Zone</u></li> <li>2. <u>The effects of the activity on the existing and anticipated function and role of the High Density Residential Zone.</u></li> <li>3. <u>The potential of the activity to compromise other activities that are enabled in the High Density Residential Zone.</u></li> <li>4. <u>The extent to which the adverse effects of the activity can be avoided, or appropriately remedied or mitigated.</u></li> <li>5. <u>The functional need or operational need for the emergency service facility to be located in the High Density Residential Zone.</u></li> </ol>		It is considered appropriate for the Council to retain full discretion over the potential establishment of emergency service facilities within the High Density Residential Zone. It is considered the potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising in the future for emergency service facilities within the High Density Residential Zone will increase as the residential intensification enabled by the IPI is realised.	
S58.158	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ	Insert a new restricted discretionary activity and discretionary activity rules into the HRZ chapter for commercial activities on ground floor of residential areas. Requested new rules include limits on GFA, hours of operation, and matters of discretion covering design, appearance and siting of the commercial activity, noise and illumination, and signage. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The consideration of commercial activities within the HRZ is already provided for on a case-by-case basis under discretionary activity rules GRZ-R19, and GRZ-R21. The NPS-UD does not require the Council to alter these rules, which are considered to appropriately provide for the consideration of commercial activities in the residential zones.	No
S5.8	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ	Amend the document to give consistency of definitions within and between various sections of the District Plan.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to make corrections to the description of the methodology used in the identification of	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					walkable catchments under submission point S5.4 – Bob Anker.  No amendments are recommended in response to submission S5.8 – Bob Anker.	
S5.9	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ	Clarification as to how, when and where the different sets of rules apply.	Reject	The rules of the SUB-HRZ chapter apply to the High Density Residential Zone as identified on the IPI planning maps.	No
S41.21	Greater Wellington Regional Council	High Density Residential Zone	Retaining Heading and Background for Subdivision in the High Density Residential Zone as notified.	Reject	Support for the background text is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to matters raised by other submitters.	No
S56.16	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-HRZ – new standard	Add a new standard as follows: <u>SUB-HRZ-SX</u> <u>Water supply, stormwater, and wastewater</u> <u>2. All activities shall comply with the water supply (including firefighting water supply), stormwater and wastewater standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.60	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-HRZ	Delete SUB-HRZ chapter 'and include rules in the SUB-RES'.	Reject	It is considered appropriate that the subdivision provisions for the HRZ are contained within the SUB-HRZ chapter to recognise the different heights and density of urban form anticipated within these zones.	No
S56.12	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-HRZ-O1	SUB-HRZ-O1 Well-functioning Urban Environments - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective – noting this is a mandatory MDRS objective.	No
S50.13	Waka Kotahi	SUB-HRZ-O2	Amend SUB-HRZ-O2 so all modes and users are catered for rather than only	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			walkers. See submission for specific requested amendments.			
S56.13	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-HRZ-O2	SUB-HRZ-O2 - Retain as notified.	Reject	Support for the objective is acknowledged, however an amendment is recommended in response to submission S50.13 – Waka Kotahi.	N/A
S5.10	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ-O3	Amend wording of SUB-HRZ-O3 to change "in" to "incorporating"	Reject	The requested wording is not considered superior or more appropriate than the notified wording.	No
S41.22	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-HRZ-O3	Retain SUB-HRZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to SUB-HRZ-O3	No
S43.8	KiwiRail	SUB-HRZ-O3	Amend SUB-HRZ-O3 as follows: 'High quality intensive residential development is provided in close proximity to rapid transport stops, community facilities and commercial activities in multistorey flats and apartments– <u>in a manner that ensures the ongoing safe and efficient operation of transport networks and minimises potential reverse sensitivity effects.</u> '	Reject	It is recommended to add potential reverse sensitivity effects to policy SUB-HRZ-P2 and to the matters of discretion of relevant rules within the SUB-HRZ chapter in response to other submissions. It is not considered necessary to repeat references to potential reverse sensitivity effects in objective SUB-HRZ-O3 to ensure potential reverse sensitivity effects are appropriately addressed.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought in relation to reverse sensitivity effects and considers that such effects should be resolved at the source.	Accept	Submission S43.8 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT: NZDF supports the wording of suggested	Reject	Submission S43.8 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			amendment, provided the amendment is not just restricted to 'transport Networks' and extends to 'regionally significant infrastructure'.			
S5.11	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ-P1	Initiate an extensive consultation process to consider the questions and practicalities surrounding passive surveillance in relation to SUB-HRZ-P1.	Reject	Initiating an extensive consultation process to consider the questions and practicalities surrounding passive surveillance in relation to SUB-HRZ-P1 is not within the scope of the IPI. No specific amendments are requested to SUB-HRZ-P1 or any other IPI provisions by this submission point.	No
S5.12	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ-P2	Council to institute a more comprehensive study as to the actual transport needs of the community in a revised Urban environment. Establish what a community focussed public transport network needs to look like for it to be effective. Present the outcome to GWRC and Government.	Reject	No specific amendments to SUB-HRZ-P2 are requested. The requested decision is the Council undertakes a comprehensive study on the transport needs of the city, and to works with GWRC and Government. This requested decision falls beyond the scope of the IPI.	No
S41.23	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-HRZ-P2	Retain SUB-HRZ-P2 as notified.	Accept in part	The submitter's support for SUB-HRZ-P2 is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to submissions S5.4 – Bob Anker, and S43.9 – KiwiRail Holdings Ltd.	No
S43.9	KiwiRail	SUB-HRZ-P4 (Note: the requested amendments apply to <b>SUB-HRZ-P2</b> .)	Amend SUB-HRZ-P4 (Note: the requested amendments to <b>SUB-HRZ-P2</b> ) as follows: 'Recognise the benefits of wider adoption of public transport through the increase of density along public transport corridors and within walkable catchments of centres <u>while ensuring development is undertaken in a manner that ensures the ongoing safe and efficient operation of transport</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>networks and minimises potential reverse sensitivity effects.'</u>			
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought in relation to reverse sensitivity effects and considers that such effects should be resolved at the source.	Reject	Submission point S43.9 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
	SUPPORTED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Waka Kotahi supports this amendment as it supports the outcomes sought by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development while giving appropriate consideration to the health and wellbeing of the future occupants.	Accept in part	Submission point S43.9 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S5.13	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ-P4	Amend SUB-HRZ-P4 to insert the word "in" before the words "urban areas"	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S41.24	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-HRZ-P4	Retain SUB-HRZ-P4 as notified.	Accept in part	Support for the policy is acknowledged, however a minor correction is recommended in response to submission point S5.13 – Bob Anker, and amendments are recommended in response to S50.14 – Waka Kotahi.	No
S50.14	Waka Kotahi	SUB-HRZ-P2 Note: The requested amendments relate to <b>SHB-HRZ-P4</b>	Amend SUB-HRZ-P2 (Note: the requested relief applies to <b>SUB-HRZ-P4</b> ) to include active transport and transport-accessibility. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S41.25	Greater Wellington	SUB-HRZ-P5	Retain SUB-HRZ-P5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to SUB-HRZ-P5 are recommended	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Regional Council					
S41.26	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-HRZ-P6	Retain SUB-HRZ-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to SUB-HRZ-P6 are recommended.	No
S41.27	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-HRZ-P9	Retain SUB-HRZ-P9 as notified.	Reject	Although support for the policy is acknowledged, this submission point is recommended for rejection on the basis that the St Patrick's Estate Precinct is recommended for significant amendments in response to another submitter.	No
S56.14	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-HRZ-R1	SUB-HRZ-R1 Subdivision within the High Density Residential Zone - Amend as follows: 1. b. ii. Each residential unit complies with the following rules and standards: <u>(x) SUB-HRZ-SX</u> 2. a. Compliance is not achieved.... under <del>HRZ-SUB-R1</del> <u>SUB-HRZ-R1</u>	Accept in part	See submission point S56.5 - Fire and Emergency New Zealand for reasons for recommending rejection of the submitter's requested new standard.  It is recommended the requested correction to the rule reference be accepted, and rule SUB-HRZ-R1.2.a be amended as follows:  <i>2. a. Compliance is not achieved with one or more of the standards specified under <del>HRZ-SUB-HRZ-R1</del></i>	Yes
S43.10	KiwiRail	SUB-HRZ-S2(6)	Retain SUB-HRZ-S2(6) as notified.	Accept	No amendments to SUB-HRZ-S2(6) are recommended.	No
S56.15	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-HRZ-S2	SUB-HRZ-S2 - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to SUB-HRZ-S2 are recommended.	No
S5.16	Bob Anker	SUB-HRZ-R9	SUB-HRZ-R9 remove the maximum size limit.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S14.1	Duncan Cameron	High Density Residential Zone	Revise the proposed high density planning extent with a logical layout around the CBD and regional shopping centres only.	Reject	As described in the section 32 evaluation the extent of walkable catchments delineated by the proposed High Density Residential Zone have been identified firstly using a 10 minute walking distance. The spatial extent was then refined to identify a practical boundary that offers the best opportunity to mitigate potential height transition impacts on existing residents. In some instances, such as a strip along the western side of Fergusson Street this exercise resulted in properties being removed from the proposed HRZ, while in other areas it resulted in properties being included.	No
S19.1	Serge Ritossa	High Density Residential Zone	I oppose High Density Residential Zones being applied in and around Upper Hutt and would like Council to revert to the MDRZ zone as it relates to my area in and around Seddon Street.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S50.1	Waka Kotahi	Entire IPI	Amend the walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone and rapid transit stops to a minimum of 800m, unless constrained by natural geographic barriers such as State Highway 2 / the Hutt River.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S50.2	Waka Kotahi	Entire IPI	Develop a walkable catchment of between 200-400m around Local Centres to enable high density development within this catchment.	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington considers that it is unclear how UHCC have identified and applied walkable catchments in its	Reject	Submission point S50.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			district. The 10-minute walkable catchment approach differs from other TAs in the Greater Wellington region.			
S50.26	Waka Kotahi	High Density Residential Zone	Amend the extent of High Density Residential Zoning to give effect to a walkable catchment of 800m from train stations, the Town Centre Zone, and the City Centre Zone.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S50.27	Waka Kotahi	High Density Residential Zone	Amend the High Density Residential Zoning to extend 200-400m around Local Centre Zones.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.2	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Entire IPI	<p>1. Expand the High Density Residential Zone and additional height controls, as shown in Appendix 4, within walkable catchments of centres and train stations, which reflect general principles of:</p> <p>a) 15min/1200m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone (CCZ) – with increased heights within 800m/10min walkable catchment of the CCZ, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay;</p> <p>b) 10min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of Town Centre Zone (TCZ) – with increased heights within 400m/5-10min walkable catchment of the TCZ, demonstrated with a Height Variation Control overlay;</p>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>c) 10min/800m walkable catchment from existing and planned rapid transit stops.</p> <p>2. Apply additional height up to 18m in the Medium Density Residential Zone within 400m/5-10min walkable catchment of Local Centre Zone (LCZ).</p> <p>3. Where a lower order centre falls within a walkable catchment of a higher-order centre or train station, enable heights consistent with the height enabled in adjacent residential zones.</p> <p>4. Accept all changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 4.</p> <p>5. Other than the changes sought in this submission and in Appendix 4, retain the zoning as notified.</p> <p>6. Make consequential amendments required to give effect to the changes sought in the submission.</p>			
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>NZDF does not support further density increases in the vicinity of Trentham Military camp without appropriate controls put in place in order to manage reverse sensitivity effects. buffer area' round NZDF facilities is included within the definition of qualifying matter area.</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
			<p>SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD and the Enabling housing Act.</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
			<p>SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD and the Enabling housing Act.</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.151	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P7	<p>Amend HRZ-P7 to enable the following building heights within the specified walkable catchments:</p> <p>a. CCZ and rapid transit stops</p> <p>i. 0m to 400m: 43m</p> <p>ii. 400m to 800m: 36m</p> <p>iii. 800 to 1200m: 22m</p> <p>b. TCZ</p> <p>i. 0m to 800m: 22m</p>	Reject	See body of report.	No
			<p>SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>The relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.151 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Reject	Submission point S58.151 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S33.25	Fuel Companies	Design Guides	Amend the Medium and High Density Design Guide so that it includes the following as an early-stage design criteria for medium and high density housing: <u>Identifying current or proposed non-residential activities nearby may also influence how the development responds; for example, minimising noise impacts of commercial activities and sites near main roads and railways.</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S50.25	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	Design Guides	Retain the Medium and High Density Design Guide, and the City Centre Design Guide as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the Medium and High Density Design Guide, or the City Centre Design Guide.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: 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 recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Reject	Submission point S50.25 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not recognise the	Reject	Submission point S50.25 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			substantially different functional and operational needs of retirement villages.			
S58.4	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Design Guides	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request the Design Guides and design guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides and design guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.</li> <li>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the Design Guides and design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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, it is considered that there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			5. Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA supports in part 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 to the extent it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: Ryman supports in part 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 to the extent it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.26	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Design Guide	Delete the reference to the Design Guide in Appendix 1 of the IPI and replace with a list of the specific design matters which Council seek be achieved.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, but opposes the remainder of the submission to have the guidelines included within rules, matters of discretion and assessment criteria to the extent it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides, on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter’s partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, but opposes the remainder of the submission to have the guidelines included within rules, matters of discretion and assessment criteria to the extent it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides, on the basis of their substantially different Functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter’s partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.96	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ	Amend GRZ Background text to:  1. Remove reference to the Medium and High Density Design Guides.  2. Kāinga Ora seeks the Design Guides and design guidelines are removed	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</p> <p>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the Design Guides and design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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, it is considered that there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.</p> <p>5. Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			
OPPOSED AND SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION IN PART: 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</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			remaining as a non-statutory tool to the extent it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
	OPPOSED AND SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION IN PART: 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 to the extent it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.123	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R11	Amend GRZ-R11 to  1. Delete references to design guides from this rule and to remove design guides from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.  2. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to:  i Provides an effective public private interface; ii Provides a well-functioning site; iii Provides high quality buildings;	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>iv Responds to the natural environment.</p> <p>3. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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.</p> <p>4. Kāinga Ora seek the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool to the extent it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool to the extent it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.126	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12	Amend GRZ-R12 as follows: Delete Matter of Discretion (1) of rule GRZ-R12 and replace it with references to the compatibility in scale, form and appearance with the planned urban built form, and the development of safe and attractive public realm and streetscape. See submission for requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.129	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12A	Delete matter of discretion (1) for GRZ-R12A that refers to the Medium and High Density Design Guide, and replace it with ' <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood.</u> '	Reject	See body of report.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.		for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their Substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.131	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-R12B	Delete matter of discretion (1) for GRZ-R12B that refers to the Medium and High Density Design Guide, and replace it with ' <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood.</u> '	Reject	See body of report.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their Substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.150	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-P6	Amend HRZ-P6 to remove reference to the Medium and High Density Design Guides and replace with wording to articulate the standard of urban design that is being sought.	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, but opposes the remainder of the submission to have the guidelines included within rules, matters of discretion and assessment criteria as it is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, but opposes the remainder	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			of the submission to have the guidelines included within rules, matters of discretion and assessment criteria as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.160	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S2	<p>Amend HRZ-S2 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guides from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides, including from the matters of discretion.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion.</li> <li>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			must follow and adhere to. The submitter seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.163	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S3	Amend HRZ-S3 to:  1. Remove the Design Guides from within the District Plan and are	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</p> <p>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides, including from the matters of discretion.</p> <p>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion.</p> <p>4. 4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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. The submitter seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.165	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S4	<p>Amend HRZ-S4 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guides from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides, including from the matters of discretion.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion.</li> <li>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>guidelines are 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. The submitter seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.167	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-S5	<p>Amend HRZ-S5 to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guides from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides, including from the matters of discretion.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion.</li> <li>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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. The submitter seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.		for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.171	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-R8	Amend HRZ-R8 to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guides from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides, including from the matters of discretion.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion.</li> <li>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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. The submitter seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p><b>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</b></p> <p>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p><b>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</b></p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.381	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P2	<p>Amend CCZ-P2 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council’s Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are amended,</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.384	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P4	<p>Amend CCZ-P4 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>As described in the section 32 evaluation, the use of design guides are considered necessary to enable the Council to give effect to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD, and MDRS Objective 1, and Policies 3 and 4.</p> <p>The use of design guides as a non-statutory tool is less likely to result in well-functioning urban environments as non-statutory tools can be overlooked or ignored in the design stage of a development. Therefore, it is considered the submitter's requested amendments will be a less effective method to encourage developments that will create attractive and safe streets, including by providing for passive surveillance. It is considered that housing will be less likely to be designed to meet the day to day needs of residents if the design elements of the design guide are not incorporated into residential developments. Leaving good design outcomes to chance would be more likely to result in examples of residential development that fail to positively contribute towards well-functioning urban environments.</p> <p>It is noted the Council has extensive experience in the implementation of residential design guidance in the district plan via the Design Guide for the Residential Centres Precinct. The use of the design guide encourages developers to address the design outcomes when designing a scheme</p>	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>		<p>plan, thus providing greater certainty as to the design outcomes that are important to the community in giving effect to the relevant abovementioned provisions of the NPS-UD, MDRS and IPI.</p>	
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p><b>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</b></p> <p>The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	<p>The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.</p>	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p><b>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</b></p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the</p>	Accept in part	<p>The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.</p>	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.385	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P5	<p>Amend CCZ-P5 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however, opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.395	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R6	<p>Amend CCZ-R6 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are 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,</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>As described in the section 32 evaluation, the use of design guides are considered necessary to enable the Council to give effect to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD, and MDRS Objective 1, and Policies 3 and 4.</p> <p>The use of design guides as a non-statutory tool is less likely to result in well-functioning urban environments as non-statutory tools can be overlooked or ignored in the design stage of a development. Therefore, it is considered the submitter's requested amendments will be a less effective method to encourage developments that will create attractive and safe streets, including by providing for passive surveillance. It is considered that housing will be less likely to be designed to meet the day to day needs of residents if the design elements of the design guide are not incorporated into residential developments. Leaving good design outcomes to chance would be more likely to result in examples of residential development that fail to positively contribute towards well-functioning urban environments.</p> <p>It is noted the Council has extensive experience in the implementation of residential design guidance in the district plan via the Design Guide for the Residential Centres Precinct. The use of the design guide encourages developers to address the design outcomes when designing a scheme plan, thus providing greater certainty as to the design outcomes that are important to the community in giving effect to the</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.		relevant abovementioned provisions of the NPS-UD, MDRS and IPI.	
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.398	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CC7-R7	<p>Amend CCZ-R7 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are 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,</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.400	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R9	<p>Amend CCZ-R9 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are 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,</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>As described in the section 32 evaluation, the use of design guides are considered necessary to enable the Council to give effect to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD, and MDRS Objective 1, and Policies 3 and 4.</p> <p>The use of design guides as a non-statutory tool is less likely to result in well-functioning urban environments as non-statutory tools can be overlooked or ignored in the design stage of a development. Therefore, it is considered the submitter's requested amendments will be a less effective method to encourage developments that will create attractive and safe streets, including by providing for passive surveillance. It is considered that housing will be less likely to be designed to meet the day to day needs of residents if the design elements of the design guide are not incorporated into residential developments. Leaving good design outcomes to chance would be more likely to result in examples of residential development that fail to positively contribute towards well-functioning urban environments.</p> <p>It is noted the Council has extensive experience in the implementation of residential design guidance in the district plan via the Design Guide for the Residential Centres Precinct. The use of the design guide encourages developers to address the design outcomes when designing a scheme plan, thus providing greater certainty as to the design outcomes that are important to the community in giving effect to the</p>	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.		relevant abovementioned provisions of the NPS-UD, MDRS and IPI.	
S58.407	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S7	<p>Amend CCZ-S7 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are amended,</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.408	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S8	<p>Amend CCZ-S8 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p><b>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</b></p> <p>The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p><b>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:</b></p> <p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the</p>	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.			
S58.413	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R13	<p>Amend CCZ-R13 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.415	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R16	<p>Amend CCZ-R16 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are 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,</li> </ol>	Reject	<p>As described in the section 32 evaluation, the use of design guides are considered necessary to enable the Council to give effect to Objective 1 of the NPS-UD, and MDRS Objective 1, and Policies 3 and 4.</p> <p>The use of design guides as a non-statutory tool is less likely to result in well-functioning urban environments as non-statutory tools can be overlooked or ignored in the design stage of a development. Therefore, it is considered the submitter's requested amendments will be a less effective method to encourage developments that will create attractive and safe streets, including by providing for passive surveillance. It is considered that housing will be less likely to be designed to meet the day to day needs of residents if the design elements of the design guide are not incorporated into residential developments. Leaving good design outcomes to chance would be more likely to result in examples of residential development that fail to positively contribute towards well-functioning urban environments.</p> <p>It is noted the Council has extensive experience in the implementation of residential design guidance in the district plan via the Design Guide for the Residential Centres Precinct. The use of the design guide encourages developers to address the design outcomes when designing a scheme plan, thus providing greater certainty as to the design outcomes that are important to the community in giving effect to the</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.		relevant abovementioned provisions of the NPS-UD, MDRS and IPI.	
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter’s partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter’s partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.426	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Design Guidelines	<p>The submitter seeks the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></li> <li>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</li> <li>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are 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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.			
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: the RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA’s primary submission, which sought to exclude Retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S58.427	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Design Guidelines	The submitter seeks the following: 1. Remove the Design Guidelines from within the District Plan and treat them as a non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. Add a note added where reference is made to such guidelines as follows:	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council’s Design Guidelines.</u></p> <p>2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.</p> <p>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u></li> <li>ii <u>Provides a well-functioning site;</u></li> <li>iii <u>Provides high quality buildings.</u></li> <li>iv <u>Responds to the natural environment.</u></li> </ul> <p>4. If the requested relief is not provided the submitter seeks that the design guidelines are 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. The submitter requests the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>			

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to exclude Retirement villages from the application of design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan, however opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to exclude retirement villages from the matters considered in the design guides on the basis of their substantially different functional and operational needs.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis that the submission point is recommended for rejection, whilst the partial opposition is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S64.20	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ – General Residential Zone 'Background' MDRS	Seek the following changes to the General Residential Zone background text:  - Expressly exclude retirement villages from the applicability of the Medium and High Density Design Guide; and  - Specifically acknowledge that retirement villages and / or	Reject	Within the General Residential Zone, retirement villages are provided for via catch-all discretionary rule GRZ-R21.  Depending on the proposed design and layout of a retirement village and its interaction with public areas, the design guide could be a relevant matter the Council wishes to consider.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			accommodation for the ageing population is anticipated / provided for in the General Residential Zone.			
S64.63	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-S4	<p>Amend the matters of discretion for HRZ-S4 to exclude retirement villages as follows...</p> <p>Matters of Discretion where Permitted Activity Standard(s) are not met.</p> <p>(a) Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>5. The matters contained in the Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1.</p> <p>(b) For retirement villages, the matters of discretion <u>under HRZ-R2(3)(a)(1)-(7) apply.</u></p>	Reject	<p>The submission point seeks to exclude retirement villages from being subject to the Medium and High Density Design Guide as a matter of discretion under the permitted activity standard for building coverage. Retirement villages are provided for within the HRZ via the cross-reference to GRZ catch-all discretionary rule GRZ-R21.</p> <p>Depending on the proposed design and layout of a retirement village and its interaction with public areas, the design guide could be a relevant matter the Council wishes to consider.</p>	No
S64.64	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-S5	<p>Amend the matters of discretion for HRZ-S5 to exclude retirement villages as follows...</p> <p>Matters of Discretion where Permitted Activity Standard(s) are not met.</p> <p>(a) Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>5. The matters contained in the Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1.</p> <p>(b) <u>For retirement villages, the matters of discretion under HRZ-R2(3)(a)(1)-(7) apply.</u></p>	Reject	<p>The submission point seeks to exclude retirement villages from being subject to the Medium and High Density Design Guide as a matter of discretion under the permitted activity standard for maximum number of residential units per site. Retirement villages are provided for within the HRZ via the cross-reference to GRZ catch-all discretionary rule GRZ-R21.</p> <p>Depending on the proposed design and layout of a retirement village and its interaction with public areas, the design guide could be a relevant matter the Council wishes to consider.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.65	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-R8	Amend the matters of discretion for HRZ-R8 to exclude retirement villages as follows...  Matters of Discretion where Permitted Activity Standard(s) are not met.  (a) Matters of discretion are restricted to:  6. The matters contained in the Medium and High Density Design Guide in Appendix 1.  (b) <u>For retirement villages, the matters of discretion under HRZ-R2(3)(a)(1)-(7) apply.</u>	Reject	The submission point seeks to exclude retirement villages from being subject to the Medium and High Density Design Guide as a matter of discretion under the restricted discretionary rule for buildings exceeding 20m in height. Retirement villages are provided for within the HRZ via the cross-reference to GRZ catch-all discretionary rule GRZ-R21.  Depending on the proposed design and layout of a retirement village and its interaction with public areas, the design guide could be a relevant matter the Council wishes to consider.	No
S64.124	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-P4	Amend CCZ-P4 as follows Provide for and encourage high-density and high quality built development that: ...  <del>6. Is consistent with the City Centre Design Guide.</del>	Reject	It is recommended the City Centre Design Guide is retained within the District Plan to provide direction to applicants and the Council on the design outcome expectations the community has for development within the City Centre Zone.	No
S64.125	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-P5	Amend CCZ-P5 as follows:... Where located along identified active frontages, require new built development and activities to:  <del>2. Be consistent with the City Centre Design Guide. Avoid new built development and activities that prevent or interrupt a continuous active street frontage along identified active frontages. Encourage new built development and activities to provide a continuous active street frontage along identified active frontages, whilst considering the individual site characteristics and environment.</del>	Reject	The requested amendment is inconsistent with policy CCZ-P2 – Residential Activity, rule CCZ-R6.1, standard CCZ-S3 (location of residential units), and restricted discretionary rule CCZ-R6.2.  It is noted individual site characteristics and the environment are already considered on a case-by-case basis via the resource consent process for proposals that do not meet permitted standards for active frontages and the location of residential units.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.131	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-S8	<p>Amend CCZ-S8 to integrate consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances. Seek to also exclude retirement villages from the applicability of the City Centre Design Guide.</p> <p>Amend CCZ-S8 as follows: Active Frontages Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... 4) Consistency with the City Centre Design Guide. <u>This matter of discretion does not apply to retirement villages.</u></p> <p>Also amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.</p>	Reject	Retirement villages are specifically provided for within the CCZ as a restricted discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R19. It is noted the matters of discretion for retirement villages under this rule do not list the City Centre Design Guide. Therefore, no specific exclusions are recommended to the CCZ zone provisions.	No
S64.134	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	Seeks that retirement villages are expressly excluded from having to apply the Medium and High Density Design Guide.	Reject	<p>Within the High Density Residential Zone and the General Residential Zone, retirement villages are provided for via catch-all discretionary rule GRZ-R21.</p> <p>Depending on the proposed design and layout of a retirement village and its interaction with public areas, the design guide could be a relevant matter the Council wishes to consider.</p>	No
S64.135	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Entire IPI	Seek that retirement villages are expressly excluded from having to apply the City Centre Zone Design Guide.	Reject	Retirement villages are specifically provided for within the CCZ as a restricted discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R19. It is noted the matters of discretion for retirement villages under this rule do not list the City Centre Design Guide. Therefore, no specific exclusions are recommended to the CCZ zone provisions.	No
S72.19	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	New Medium and High	Introduce new Medium and High Density Design Guide - Review these	Reject	The submission point seeks the review of the design guide with Tangata Whenua to	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Inc (late submission)	Density Design Guide	design guides with Tangata Whenua to ensure Design Guides address Tangata Whenua principles and values and amend appropriate parts of the Plan to reflect Tangata Whenua may want to use their own design guide when and if such guidance is available.		ensure the design guide addresses Tangata Whenua principles and values.  No specific amendments are sought, and it is noted the requested relief would require work between the Council and Tangata Whenua on reviewing the design guide. The submitter may wish to provide more information on potential specific amendments to the design guide at the hearing to enable the amendments to be considered.  For these reasons no amendments are recommended in response to this submission point.	
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes this submission point as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept	Submission point S72.19 is recommended for rejection; however the submitter may provide additional information at the hearing.	N/A
S72.17	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	CCZO1, CCZ-O3, CCZO4, CCZ-S2 and CCZ-S4 and CCZR12	City Centre Zone introduction / Background, CCZO1, CCZ-O3, CCZO4, CCZ-S2 and CCZ-S4 and CCZR12 - Include provisions where Tangata Whenua values apply that these standards need to have more space and less or no additional height.	Reject	It is unclear what specific amendments are being sought by the submission. The submitter may wish to provide more information either prior to or during the hearing to enable the consideration of amendments to the IPI.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear	Accept	Submission S72.17 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Ryman opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission S72.17 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.374	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ	Amend the CCZ spatial extent as follows: 1. Accept the changes the submitter requests to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 4 of the submission to expand the extent of the City Centre zone. 2. If the relief sought in this submission point and Appendix 4 of the submission are not granted, the following relief is sought: a. Expansion of CCZ as proposed in this submission – height variation control of 45m to HRZ. 3. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought in this submission.	Reject	The NPS-UD does not require the Council to amend the spatial extent of the City Centre Zone via the IPI. The submission does not demonstrate why an expansion to the CCZ is a more appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives, not does it provide an evidence base to justify the need for changes to the spatial extent of the CCZ.	No
	OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have	Accept	Submission S58.374 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3			
	OPPOSED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  NZDF is not supportive of non-notification provisions for the general subdivision chapter.	Accept	Submission S58.374 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.375	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ	Retain CCZ Background text as notified.	Reject	Support for the background text is acknowledged, however a number of amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S58.389	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ Rule Table	Retain CCZ- Rule table as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the CCZ rule table.	No
S64.15	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	All Commercial Zones - Policies	Seek a new policy is added in all commercial zones as follows - <u>Density standards: Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of development.</u>	Reject	The consideration of an effects baseline is at the discretion of the Council under Sections 95D(b), 95E(2), and 104(2) of the RMA.  It is at the discretion of the Council on a case-by-case basis whether to apply a permitted baseline during the consideration of a resource consent application. The requested policy is inappropriate, as the Council receives its powers to consider a permitted baseline via the RMA, not via a policy in the District Plan.	No
S64.119	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ	Amend City Centre Zone introduction as follows:  High-density development and intensification is enabled and encouraged, <u>recognising that the urban environment, while maintaining and improving</u> including amenity values, <u>will</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people and communities, especially in the public realm.....</u> New buildings and development are well designed and reflect the <u>well-functioning high quality</u> urban environment of the City Centre Zone.....substantial additions and alterations to existing buildings will allow for an assessment of the proposal to ensure that any new development is well designed and of a high quality <del>and consistent with the City Centre Design Guide.....</del> Residential units need to be located above ground floor along identified active frontages <u>unless residential activity at ground floor is appropriate assessed on a case by case basis.</u></p>			
S72.18	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	CCZ – City Centre Zone	CCZ-City Centre Zone - Deletion Matters of Discretion - These need to be retained in the Plan to give signal to developers that a consent application can be vetoed on the basis of cumulative effects, lack of infrastructure and most importantly whether there are any Tangata Whenua values are breached.	Reject	<p>It is assumed the submitter is referring to the existing <i>Matters for Consideration</i> that are proposed to be deleted as part of amending the City Centre Zone provisions. The Matters for Consideration refer to cumulative effects however the submitter may wish to clarify this during the hearing.</p> <p>If this assumption is correct, it is noted the Matters for Consideration within the City Centre Zone chapter that are proposed for deletion are not referred to as matters of discretion within the rules, and therefore they do not have legal status as matters of discretion.</p> <p>Although they may provide useful guidance during the consideration of resource</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					consent applications for discretionary (unrestricted) and non-complying activities, it is noted a district plan is not required to identify the specific matters that will be considered by the Council in the consideration of discretionary and non-complying activity resource consents. On this basis the Council is free to consider any matter it deems relevant for discretionary and non-complying activities, including cumulative effects, pursuant to Sections 104(a) and (c), and 104B of the RMA.  For these reasons it is recommended the submission point be rejected.	
S58.376	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-01	Retain CCZ-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-01 are recommended.	No
S64.120	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-01	Amend CCZ-01 as follows:...It is a <u>well-functioning</u> urban environment <del>vibrant and attractive</del> and accommodates a wide range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities.	Reject	The notified wording of CCZ-01 is considered to be appropriate for the City Centre Zone, and it is noted it does not conflict with the NPS-UD objectives or policies as it does not refer to the retention or enhancement of amenity values.	No
S50.22	Waka Kotahi	CCZ-02	Amend CZZ-02 to refer to 'access to active and public transport' and delete the reference to 'a strong pedestrian focus'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	It is not considered appropriate to amend Objective CCZ-02 as requested, as the objective wording reflects the aim of street frontages to create a lively environment with a strong pedestrian focus. This focus on pedestrians is consistent with the use of footpaths along street frontages.	No
S58.377	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-02	Retain CCZ-02 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-02 are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.121	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-O2	Retain CCZ-O2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-O2 are recommended.	No
S58.378	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-O3	Retain CCZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-O3 are recommended.	No
S50.23	Waka Kotahi	CZ-P1	Amend CCZ-P1 to add reference to 'access to active and public transport'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	It is not appropriate to amend Policy CCZ-P1 as requested, as the policy encourages activities with a strong pedestrian focus to locate along roads with active street frontages to create a vibrant interface with public spaces. This is a different focus to that requested by the submitter – which is to change the focus of the submission to refer to access to active and public transport.  This focus on pedestrians is consistent with the use of footpaths along street frontages, and aligns with the wording of Objective CCZ-O1.	No
S58.380	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P1	Amend CCZ-P1 to delete reference to 'character' and insert reference to 'planned urban built form'. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.122	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-P1	Amend CCZ-P1 as follows: 1. Enable a wide range of activities that are compatible with the anticipated purpose, <u>and</u> character <del>and amenity values</del> of the CCZ- City Centre Zone.	Reject	It is the considered the wording of CCZ-P1 – as amended by submission point S58.380 is the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives – and is consistent with the NPS-UD.	No
S58.382	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P1 (Note: amendment)	Amend CCZ-P1 - 1a. to state (Note: submitter is showing amendments to <b>CCZ-P2 – 1a</b> ):	Reject	It is noted the requested amendments would be inconsistent with standard CCZ-S3 Location of Residential Units. Standard CCZ-	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
		is actually to CCZ-P2)	Residential units are located above ground floor <u>or at ground floor where located to the rear of buildings where not accessed from an active frontage;</u>		S3 requires all residential units to be located above ground floor level. Residential units at ground floor level are a discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R21.  Clause 2 of Policy CCZ-P2 provides direction to decision makers on resource consent applications for proposed establishment of residential units at ground floor level.  Therefore, the existing wording of Policy CCZ-P2 is considered to be the most appropriate wording to achieve the relevant objectives, as it reflects the rule categories for residential units at ground floor level while also providing direction for the consideration of discretionary resource consent applications for residential units at ground floor level.	
SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point. Residential activities, including retirement villages, should be enabled at ground floor level.	Reject	Submission point S58.382 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point. Residential activities, including retirement villages, should be enabled at ground floor level.	Reject	Submission point S58.382 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S64.123	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-P2	Amend CCZ-P2 as follows: 1) Provide for high-density residential activity and development where: a) Residential units are located above ground floor, <u>unless ground floor residential activity is assessed to be appropriate on a case by case basis;</u> b) Residential units and / or	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>retirement units are designed to i. ... ..  d)  It is consistent with the City Centre Design Guide. 2) Only allow for the location of residential units <u>and / or retirement units</u> on the ground floor where: a) <del>It is not located along an Active Street Frontage identified on the planning maps</del> b). It does not preclude a positive interface with the public space; c. It will not compromise amenity values for residents ... f. <u>When taking into account individual site characteristics and environments it is considered that residential units and / or retirement units are appropriate on the ground floor.</u> 4) <del>Avoid the location of residential units on the ground floor along Active Street Frontages identified on the planning maps.</del></p>			
S56.61	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-P3 Other Activities	<p>CCZ-P3 Other Activities - Amend as follows:  <u>5. There is a functional and operational need for the activity to locate in the City Centre Zone.</u></p>	Reject	<p>The list of criteria contained within the policy is a holistic list – meaning all proposed 'other activities' will be considered against all subclauses in the policy. The requested inclusion of a clause to refer to a functional and operation need for an activity to be located in the City Centre Zone will have the unintended consequence of raising likelihood of other activities being deemed to be inconsistent with the policy on account of a lack of a demonstrated operational or functional need to be located within the CCZ.</p> <p>It is noted <i>emergency service facilities</i> are already subject to the consideration of the functional and operations need to be</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					located within the CCZ as a matter of discretion under rule CCZ-R17.	
S58.383	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P3	Retain CCZ-P3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-P3 are recommended.	No
S50.24	Waka Kotahi	CCZ-P4	Amend CZ-P4 to add reference to 'access to active and public transport'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.386	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P6	Retain CCZ-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-P6.	No
S64.126	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-P6	Amend CCZ-P6 to clarify that activities covered by CCZ-P2 are compatible.	Reject	<p>The compatibility of activities is determined through a combination of the activity status of a proposed activity, its' actual and potential effects on the environment, and its consistency with the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan and any other relevant higher-order statutory planning documents such as the RPS and National Policy Statements.</p> <p>It is not the role of Policy CCZ-P6 to attempt to specifically identify all activities that would be compatible within the City Centre Zone on all sites within the zone.</p>	No
S58.387	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-P7	Retain CCZ-P7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-P7.	No
S58.390	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R1	Retain CCZ-R1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R1.	



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.391	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R2	Retain CCZ-R2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R2.	No
S58.392	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R3	Retain CCZ-R3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R3.	No
S58.393	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R4	Retain CCZ-R4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R4.	No
S58.394	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R5	Retain CCZ-R5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R5.	No
S58.396	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R6	Amend CCZ-R6 non-notification clause under CCZ-R6(2) and CCZ-R6(3) as follows: Notification: An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly <u>or limited</u> notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.	Reject	It is appropriate to retain the Council's discretion to process resource consents under rule CCZ-R6 by way of limited notification where the location of residential units standard or the noise and ventilation standard is not complied with. Non-compliance with these standards has the potential to result in adverse effects that may affect specific persons. Such effects include reverse sensitivity effects.	No
S56.62	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-R7	CCZ-R7 Erection, Construction and Development of Additions to Existing Buildings - Add new matter of discretion to CCZ-R7(2) as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>8. The extent, and effects of the non-compliance with CCZ-S6.</u>	Reject	For an activity to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R7.2, compliance with CCZ-S6 for water supply, stormwater, and wastewater must be achieved. If compliance with CCZ-S6 is not achieved, the activity cannot be considered under rule CCZ-R7.2, and must be considered as a discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R7.3.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.397	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R7	Amend CCZ-R7 standard 1.2.a, and 2.3.a. to delete reference to CCZ-R14 and replace it with CCZ-R7. See submission for requested amendment.	Accept	The requested amendment will correct a typographical error.  It is recommended to amend rule CCZ-R7.2.a as follows:  2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary  Where:  a. Compliance is not achieved with <del>CCZ-R14</del> 1.a; and	Yes
S58.399	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R8	Retain CCZ-R8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R8 in response to submissions.	No
S58.410	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R10	Retain CCZ-R10 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R10 in response to submissions.	No
S58.411	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R11	Retain CCZ-R11 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R11 in response to submissions.	No
S58.412	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R12	Retain CCZ-R11 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment to add an advice note to CCZ-R12 is recommended in response to submission S72.12 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	No
S56.65	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-R13	CCZ-R13 Redevelopment, Alteration and Repair of Existing Buildings - Add new matter of discretion to CCZ-R13(2) as follows:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>8. The extent, and effects of the non-compliance with CCZ-S6.</u>	Reject	For an activity to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R13.2, compliance with CCZ-S6 for water supply, stormwater, and wastewater must be achieved. If compliance with CCZ-S6 is not achieved, the activity cannot be considered under rule CCZ-R13.2, and must be considered as a discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R13.3.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S51.12	Ministry of Education	CCZ-R15	Rule CCZ – R15 Retain as proposed.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R15.	No
S58.414	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R15	Retain CCZ-R15 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R15.	No
S56.66	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-R16	CCZ-R16 New Buildings and Structures - Add new matter of discretion to CCZ-R16(1) as follows:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: <u>9. The extent, and effects of the non-compliance with CCZ-S6.</u>	Reject	For an activity to be considered as a restricted discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R16.1, compliance with CCZ-S6 for water supply, stormwater, and wastewater must be achieved. If compliance with CCZ-S6 is not achieved, the activity cannot be considered under rule CCZ-R16.1, and must be considered as a discretionary activity under rule CCZ-R16.2.	No
S64.132	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-R16	Amend CCZ-R16 as follows:... <u>3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where:</u> <u>a) Compliance is not achieved with one or more of the standards under CCZ-R16-1.a, and the activity is for the construction of buildings associated with a retirement village. Matters of discretion are restricted to: (1) The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: CCZ-S2 and CCZS4; (2) The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; (3) The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; (4) When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: (a) The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and (b) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. (5) The positive</u>	Reject	The submission points requests rule CCZ-R16 be amended to incorporate specific retirement village provisions into the City Centre Zone chapter.  It is noted rule CCZ-R16 manages all new building and structures in the CCZ as a restricted discretionary activity. The rule manages new buildings – irrespective of the intended activities that will be carried out from the new buildings. The matters of discretion under rule CCZ-R16 focus on non-activity related matters such as the consideration of the effects on the anticipated built form, amenity, scale, context, the safety and vibrancy of public spaces, active street frontages, building forms, colours and visual interest, and consistency with the City Centre Design Guide.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village. Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with CCZ-S2 and CCZ-S4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>		It is considered that specific provisions for retirement villages as an activity as opposed to new buildings, are already managed under rule CCZ-R19. No amendments are therefore recommended to CCZ-R16 in response to this submission point.	
S56.67	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-R17	CCZ-R17 Emergency Service Facility - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R17.	No
S58.416	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R17	Retain CCZ-R17 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R17.	No
S58.417	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R18	Retain CCZ-R18 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R18.	No
S58.418	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R19	Retain CCZ-R19 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R19.	No
S64.133	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-R19	Amend CCZ-R19 for retirement villages to be a permitted activity in the City Centre Zone.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.419	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R20	Retain CCZ-R20 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R20.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.420	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R21	Retain CCZ-R21 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R21.	No
S58.421	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R22	Retain CCZ-R22 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R22.	No
S58.422	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R23	Retain CCZ-R23 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R23.	No
S58.423	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R24	Retain CCZ-R24 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R24.	
S58.424	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R25	Retain CCZ-R25 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R25.	No
S58.425	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-R26	Retain CCZ-R26 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-R26.	No
S58.401	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S1	Retain CCZ-S1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-S1.	No
S56.63	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-S2	CCZ-S2 Where the side or rear boundary of a site adjoins a High Density Residential Zone, General Residential Zone, or Open Space Zone, the following Setback standard applies. Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code.</u> <u>Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p> <p>Add new matter of discretion: <u>The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u></p>			
S58.402	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S2	Retain CCZ-S2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-S2 are recommended.	N/A
S64.128	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-S2	Retain CCZ-S2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-S2 are recommended.	N/A
S58.406	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S3	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 and replace with the submitter's requested amendments as follows: <u>All residential units must be located above ground floor level. Along active frontages identified on the planning maps all residential units must be located above ground floor level, except that residential units may be located on the ground floor where pedestrian access to a residential unit does not interrupt or prevent an active frontage as required by CCZ-S8.</u></p>	Reject	<p>As the most significant centre in Upper Hutt City, standard CCZ-S3 requires residential units to be located above ground floor level to ensure the City Centre Zone can fulfil its' purpose as the principal civic and cultural centre (as described in Objective CCZ-O1). It is considered the established of ground residential units as a permitted activity could compromise achieving this objective.</p> <p>Policy CCZ-P2 provides direction to decision makers on resource consent applications for proposed establishment of residential units at ground floor level – however the matters that need to be given regard do not provide a guarantee that resource consent would be granted. It is noted the matters that regard must be had under Policy CCZ-P2 include</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>potential effects such as reverse sensitivity effects. Potential effects such as reverse sensitivity effects require the case-by-case consideration of the actual and potential effects of residential units at ground floor. The submitter's requested amendments to CCZ-S3 would prevent this case-by-case assessment from taking place, which could result in adverse effects that are contrary to the objectives of the City Centre Zone.</p> <p>Consequently, the request to amend the permitted activity standard for the location of residential units in the CCZ is recommended for rejection.</p>	
S64.129	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-S3	Seek CCZ-S3 to be amended to acknowledge that ground level residential units and / or retirement units can be provided if deemed to be appropriate when considering the individual site characteristics and environment.	Reject	It is considered CCZ-P2 already appropriately acknowledges that ground level residential units can be provided if deemed to be appropriate on a case-by-case basis via the resource consent process.	No
S58.404	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S4	Delete CCZ-S4 and replace with the submitter's requested amendments as follows: <u>Buildings and structures must not project beyond a:</u> <u>a. For boundaries with the High Density Residential Zone:</u> <u>i. 60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 20m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</u> <u>ii. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> <u>Where the boundary forms part of a</u>	Reject	It is considered the most appropriate method to achieve the objectives of the CCZ, the HRZ and the GRZ is to apply the CCZ-S4 height in relation to boundary standard as notified. The requested increase in height envelope measurement point to 19 metres (from the proposed 4 metres height measurement) could result in significant adverse effects to occupiers within adjoining High Density Residential and General Residential Zones. It is considered proposed breaches of CCZ-S4 should be considered on a case-by-case basis to enable the Council to appropriately	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way.</u> c. <u>Residential chimneys, electricity transmission towers, masts, radio, television and telecommunication antenna and aerials.</u>		consider any actual and potential adverse effects on other persons, and ensure any adverse effects are not contrary to the relevant objectives and policies.  It is also considered the requested amendments present an unnecessarily complex standard, and that the submission does not appear to include an effects-based justification for the requested significant changes to CCZ-S4.  Consequently, submission point S58.404 is recommended for rejection.	
S64.130	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	CCZ-S4	Amend CCZ-S4 as follows: Where the side or rear boundary of a site adjoins a High Density Residential Zone, or General Residential Zone, <del>or Open Space and Recreation Zone</del> , the following Height in Relation to Boundary standard applies: ...	Reject	Height in relation to boundary encroachments along boundaries adjoining the Open Space and Recreation Zone has the potential to adversely affect existing and proposed activities and buildings within the Open Space and Recreation Zone. It is considered inappropriate to exclude this zone from CCZ-S4 without thorough scenario testing (which does not appear to be included in the submission).	No
S58.405	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S5	Retain CCZ-S5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to CCZ-S5 in response to submissions.	No
S56.64	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CCZ-S6	CCZ-S6 Water Supply, Stormwater and Wastewater - Amend as follows: All activities shall comply with the water supply <u>(including firefighting water supply)</u> , stormwater and wastewater standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.	Reject	As noted within the submission, the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works contains firefighting requirements. On this basis the requested additional text within CCZ-S6 is not necessary.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.406	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S6	Retain CCZ-S6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-S6 are recommended.	No
S56.60	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New Objective and Policy	<p>Add a new objective and policy as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZ-OX Three Waters Infrastructure Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Integrated</u></li> <li>• <u>Effective</u></li> <li>• <u>Efficient</u></li> <li>• <u>Functional</u></li> <li>• <u>Safe</u></li> <li>• <u>Sustainable</u></li> <li>• <u>Resilient</u></li> </ul> <p><u>CCZ-PX Three Waters Servicing</u></p> <p><u>a. All subdivision and development provide integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to their location and intended use.</u></p> <p><u>b. Where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term, then avoid further intensification until constraints are resolved.</u></p>	Reject	<p>The submitter has requested the same objective and policy be inserted into the SUB-GEN chapter under submission number S56.5 - Fire and Emergency New Zealand.</p> <p>See the reasoning for the recommendation to reject submission S56.5 within the SUB-GEN chapter of this table above.</p>	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis</p>	Accept	Submission point S56.60 is recommended for rejection	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.	Accept	Submission point S56.60 is recommended for rejection	N/A
S5.30	Bob Anker	TCZ – Town Centre Zone	Confirm that the “City Centre Zone” clauses are to be removed. Also resolve the issue of whether the ‘Centre Zones’ are enclaves with distinct sets of rules. Resolve where zones overlap which rules prevail.	Reject	No overlaps of zone boundaries have been identified on the IPI maps.  References to the City Centre Zone are based on the centres hierarchy that identifies each centre by its role and function within and beyond the Upper Hutt community. The naming of the City Centre Zone and the other centre zones is consistent with the descriptions contained in the National Planning Standards Clause 8 – Zone Framework Standard <sup>1</sup> .  As detailed in the section 32 evaluation, the purpose of all provisions in the IPI that seek to ensure uses and development in other centres does not undermine the role and function of the City Centre Zone are to give effect to RPS Objective 22 and Policy 30.	No

<sup>1</sup> <https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/national-planning-standards-november-2019-updated-2022.pdf>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>This is to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of the Upper Hutt sub-regional centre in accordance with RPS Policy 30. The explanatory text to Policy 30 provides additional context as follows:</p> <p><i>The range of appropriate land uses to be encouraged through this policy will vary depending on the character and context of each centre. For this reason, policy 30 requires the region's district and city councils to determine the range and location of land uses, supported by appropriate social infrastructure to be encouraged and/or controlled in order to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of the relevant centre managed through its district plan.</i></p> <p>The submitter's concern that the purpose of these provisions are for 'anti-competitive restraint of trade' purposes are therefore unfounded.</p> <p>With regard to the submitter's query regarding the potential overlap of zones, and therefore provisions, it is noted each zone is clearly mapped and no overlaps of zones has been identified on the IPI Maps. Each zone chapter contains a bespoke set of provisions that apply to that zone – noting however that there may also be district-wide provisions that apply in the District-wide chapter.</p>	
S5.31	Bob Anker	TCZ – Town Centre Zone	Remove city centre zone clauses from TCZ policies and rules.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
		policies and rules				
S58.323	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ	Amend the TCZ spatial extent as shown in Appendix 4 to the submission. If the relief sought is not granted, the following relief is sought: a. Silverstream TCZ – height variation control of 29m to HRZ. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought in this submission. See the submission and its Appendix 4 for details.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3	Accept	Submission point S58.323 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.325	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ	Amend the TCZ - Introduction to: 1. delete references to Silverstream Centre. 2. (2) Add reference to Trentham as a town centre zone in the Zone provisions.	Reject	Trentham Local Centre Zone is not recommended to be rezoned to Town Centre Zone. Silverstream Town Centre Zone is the only Town Centre Zone in the City, therefore the retention of specific references to it in the TCZ provisions is acceptable.	No
S58.338	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ	Retain TCZ rule table as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the TCZ rule table.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.105	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ	Seek that the Town Centre Zone Introduction is amended to provide for residential activities at the ground level where appropriate (including retirement villages).	Reject	TCZ-S5 already provides for residential units at ground floor where not along active frontages identified on the Planning Maps. It is not recommended to amend the IPI to include any additional retirement village-specific provisions to the Town Centre Zone.	No
S58.326	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-O1	Retain TCZ-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-O1 in response to submissions.	No
S64.106	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-O1	Retain TCZ-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-O1 in response to submissions.	No
S72.16	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	TCZO1, TCZ-O3, TCZO4, TCZ-R3, TCZS2 and TCZ-S3	Town Centre Zone introduction, TCZO1, TCZ-O3, TCZ-O4, TCZ-R3, TCZS2 and TCZ-S3 - Include provisions where Tangata Whenua values apply that these standards need to have more space and less or no additional height.	Reject	Standards TCZ-S2 and TCZ-S3 are the height in relation to boundary standard and setback standard where a site in the TCZ adjoins a residential zone or Open Space and Recreation Zone. These standards apply the MDRS height in relation to boundary and setback density standards to manage adverse effects on adjoining residential zone and open space zone sites to the same degree as the MDRS.  The submission does not include specific requested amendments or sufficient information to justify reducing these standards, however the submitter may wish to address this during the hearing to enable the consideration of the requested amendments.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear	Accept	Submission S72.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Ryman opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission S72.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.327	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-O2	Retain TCZ-O2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-O2.	No
S64.107	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-O2	Amend TCZ-O2 as follows: The Town Centre Zone is a <u>well-functioning</u> <del>vibrant, attractive and safe</del> urban environment that is characterised by high-density urban development, well-designed buildings and high quality public spaces.	Reject	It is noted all subdivision, use and development within the TCZ that requires a resource consent is subject to the objectives within the Strategic Direction chapter including CMU-O1, which seeks as outcome that <i>the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones are well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</i>  Therefore, it is not considered necessary to refer to 'well-functioning' within objective TCZ-O2, as this is already addressed by CMU-O1. The existing wording is considered to appropriately link with the TCZ policies, rules and standards.	No
S58.328	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-O3	Retain TCZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-O3.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.330	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P1	Retain TCZ-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-O3.	No
S58.331	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P2	Retain TCZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-P2.	No
S64.108	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-P2	Amend TCZ-P2 to remove limitations on ground level residential activities: Provide for medium to high density residential development and activity where: 1) The residential units are located above ground floor, <u>where located along an active frontage identified on the planning maps, or at ground floor where assessed as appropriate on a case by case basis;</u> 2) It does not interrupt or preclude an attractive frontage that provides a positive interface with the public space; ...	Reject	See body of report.	No
S56.54	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-P3	TCZ-P3 Other activities Amend as follows:  Only allow for other activities, including larger scale commercial and retail activities where:  <u>6. There is a functional and operational need for the activity to locate in the Town Centre Zone.</u>	Reject	The list of criteria contained within the policy is a holistic list – meaning all proposed 'other activities' will be considered against all subclauses in the policy. The requested inclusion of a clause to refer to a functional and operation need for an activity to be located in the Town Centre Zone will have the unintended consequence of raising likelihood of other activities being deemed to be inconsistent with the policy on account of a lack of a demonstrated operational or functional need to be located within the TCZ.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					It is noted emergency service facilities are already subject to the consideration of the functional and operations need to be located within the TCZ as a matter of discretion under rule TCZ-R14.	
S58.332	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P3	Retain TCZ-P3 as notified.	Accept	No amendment are recommended to TCZ-P3.	No
S58.333	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P4	Retain TCZ-P4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-P4.	No
S64.109	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-P4	Amend TCZ-P4 to clarify that activities covered by LCZ-P2 are compatible.	Reject	<p>The compatibility of activities is determined through a combination of the activity status of a proposed activity, its' actual and potential effects on the environment, and its consistency with the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan and any other relevant higher-order statutory planning documents such as the RPS and National Policy Statements.</p> <p>It is not the role of Policy TCZ-P4 to attempt to specifically identify all activities that would be compatible within the Town Centre Zone on all sites within the zone.</p>	No
S58.334	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P5	Retain TCZ-P5 as notified.	Reject	Support for TCZ-P5 is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to submission S64.110.	No
S64.110	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-P5	Amend TCZ-P5 as follows:.....4. <del>Is well designed and</del> contributes to a <u>well functioning an attractive</u> urban environment; and.....	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.335	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P6	Retain TCZ-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-P6.	No
S58.336	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P7	Retain TCZ-P7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-P7.	No
S56.55	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R1	TCZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R1.	No
S58.339	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R1	Amend TCZ-R1 to: (1) Add TCZ-S1 - Height to the public notification preclusion clause. (2) Amend the notification preclusion clause so TCZ-S4 - Active Frontages is precluded from limited and public notification. (3) Add TCZ-S9 - Water Supply, Stormwater and Wastewater), and TCZ-S10 - Hydraulic Neutrality to the public and limited notification preclusion clause.	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	The partial opposition is recommended to be accepted. The partial support is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:	Accept in part	The partial opposition is recommended to be accepted. The partial support is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman’s primary submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</p>			
S64.111	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-R1	<p>Amend TCZ-R1 as follows:  ...  <u>3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u>  <u>Where:</u>  d) <u>Compliance is not achieved with LCZ-R1-1.a or LCZ-R1-1.b, or compliance is not achieved with one or more of the standards under LCZ-R1-1.c, and the activity is for the construction of buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) <u>The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3 and LCZ-S7.</u></li> <li>(2) <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></li> <li>(3) <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></li> <li>(4) <u>When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider:</u></li> </ol>	Reject	<p>It is not necessary to include specific provisions within rule TCZ-R1 for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.</p> <p>Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the Town Centre Zone as a discretionary activity under Rule TCZ-R19.</p> <p>The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(a) <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>(5) <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village. Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>			
S58.340	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R2	Retain TCZ-R2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R2.	No
S58.341	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R3	Retain TCZ-R3 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment is recommended to add an advice note to TCZ-R3 in response to submission S72.12 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	No
S58.342	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R4	Retain TCZ-R4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R4.	No
S58.343	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R5	Retain TCZ-R5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R5.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.344	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R6	Retain TCZ-R6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R6.	No
S58.345	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R7	Retain TCZ-R7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R7.	No
S58.346	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R8	Retain TCZ-R8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R8.	No
S51.11	Ministry of Education	TCZ-R9	Rule TCZ – R9 Retain as proposed.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R9.	No
S58.347	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R9	Retain TCZ-R9 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R9.	No
S58.348	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R10	Retain TCZ-R10 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R10.	No
S58.349	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R11	Amend TCZ-R11 to add TCZ-R11-2.c to the public notification preclusion clause. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The requested amendment to the notification preclusion clause in rule TCZ-R11-2 is not necessary as the notification preclusion specifies TCZ-R11-2.b, which includes TCZ-S8 (landscaping and screening).	No
S58.350	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R12	Amend TCZ-R12 by: (1) Deleting standard 1.a that restricts the number of permitted activity residential units per site to 6. (2) Delete the matters of discretion under 2.a that address the effects of residential activities. (3) Delete the public notification preclusion clause.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			(4) Amend the public and limited notification preclusion clause by deleting reference to LCZ-S7. (5) Make consequential amendments. See the submission for specific requested amendments.			
S58.351	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R13	Retain TCZ-R13 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R13.	No
S56.56	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R14	TCZ-R14 Emergency Service Facility - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R14.	No
S58.352	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R14	Retain TCZ-R14 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R14.	No
S58.353	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R15	Retain TCZ-R15 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R15.	No
S58.354	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R16	Retain TCZ-R16 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R16.	No
S58.355	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R17	Retain TCZ-R17 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R17.	No
S58.356	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R18	Retain TCZ-R18 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R18.	No
S58.357	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R19	Retain TCZ-R19 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R19.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.112	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-R19	Amend the activity status in TCZ-R19 of retirement villages to be a permitted activity in the Town Centre Zone.	Reject	Retirement villages include a mix of residential and non-residential activities, and are often large-scale activities with respect to the land footprint necessary to accommodate all retirement village activities. It is considered appropriate the Council is able to consider the establishment of retirements villages within the Town Centre Zone on a case-by-case basis to ensure consistency with the relevant objectives and policies of the TCZ. It is considered rule TCZ-R19 is the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives.	
S58.358	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R20	Retain TCZ-R20 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R20.	No
S58.359	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R21	Retain TCZ-R21 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R21.	No
S58.360	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R22	Retain TCZ-R22 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R22.	No
S58.361	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R23	Retain TCZ-R23 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R23.	No
S58.362	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R24	Retain TCZ-R24 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R24.	No
S58.363	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-R25	Retain TCZ-R25 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-R25.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.364	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S1	Amend TCZ-S1 - Height to increase maximum permitted building height from 26 metres to 36 metres. See submission for requested amendment.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S64.113	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-S1	Amend TCZ-S1 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	TCZ-S1 is the permitted standard for building height. Retirement villages include buildings, and there is no identified justification for excluding buildings within retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	No
S58.365	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S2	Amend TCZ-S2 to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. delete reference to 'or Open Space and Recreation Zone'.</li> <li>2. Insert a reference into standard 1.a. so it only applies to the Medium Density Residential Zone (which the submitter is seeking the creation of under a separate submission point).</li> <li>3. Insert a new height in relation to boundary standard of 60 degrees measured from a point 8m vertically above boundaries that adjoin a site zoned High Density Residential Zone. See submission for requested amendments.</li> </ol>	Accept in part	It is recommended to accept this submission point in part for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Height in relation to boundary encroachments on a boundary with a site zoned Open Space and Recreation Zone has the potential to adversely affect activities and buildings within the Open Space and Recreation Zone. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to delete reference to this zone from TCZ-S2.</li> <li>2. It is not recommended to rename the General Residential Zone the Medium Density Residential Zone (as addressed under other Submitter 58 submission points). However, it is considered appropriate to increase the flexibility of the height envelope where a TCZ site is adjoins a High Density Residential Zoned site. In these scenarios, it is considered appropriate to apply the HRZ height in relation to boundary standard that begins at a point 5.0m vertically above</li> </ol>	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>ground level along the boundary as specified in HRZ-S3.</p> <p>3. It is not considered appropriate to increase the height envelope standard to a point 8.0 metres vertically above ground level under standard TCZ-S2 due to the potential adverse effects that may result on adjoining and adjacent sites – including residential zoned sites that are nearby but do not share a boundary with the TCZ site.</p> <p>It is recommended to amend TCZ-S2 as follows:</p> <p>Where the side or rear <b>boundary</b> of a <b>site</b> adjoins a Residential Zone or Open Space and Recreation Zone the following <b>Height in Relation to Boundary</b> standard applies:</p> <p>1. <b>Buildings</b> must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above <b>ground level</b> along all <b>boundaries that adjoin a General Residential Zone or Open Space and Recreation Zone</b>, as shown on the following diagram. Where the <b>boundary</b> forms part of a legal right of way, <b>entrance strip</b>, access <b>site</b>, or pedestrian access way, the <b>height in relation to boundary</b> applies from the farthest <b>boundary</b> of that legal right of way, <b>entrance strip</b>, access <b>site</b>, or pedestrian access way.</p>	



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>2. <b>Buildings</b> must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5 metres vertically above <b>ground level</b> along all <b>boundaries</b> that adjoin a High Density Residential Zone. Where the <b>boundary</b> forms part of a legal right of way, <b>entrance strip</b>, access <b>site</b>, or pedestrian access way, the <b>height in relation to boundary</b> applies from the farthest <b>boundary</b> of that legal right of way, <b>entrance strip</b>, access <b>site</b>, or pedestrian access way.</p>	
S64.114	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-S2	<p>The RVA seeks to amend TCZ-S2 as follows:</p> <p>Where the side or rear boundary of a site adjoins a Residential Zone or <del>Open Space and Recreation Zone</del> the following Height in Relation to Boundary standard applies: ... Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.</p>	Reject	<p>Height in relation to boundary encroachments on a boundary with a site zoned Open Space and Recreation Zone has the potential to adversely affect activities and buildings within the Open Space and Recreation Zone. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to delete reference to this zone from TCZ-S2.</p> <p>Buildings within the TCZ have the potential to generate the same effects regardless of their intended use. It would therefore be inappropriate to exclude buildings within retirement villages from the standard.</p>	No
S56.57	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-S3	<p>TCZ-S3 Setback Add advice note:  <u>Advice note:</u>  <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at</u></p>	Reject	<p>It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>		method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	
S58.366	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S3	Retain TCZ-S3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-S3.	No
S64.115	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-S3	Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	<p>TCZ-S3 is the permitted standard for the setback of buildings from side and rear boundaries where a TCZ site adjoins a residential zone or open space and recreation zone.</p> <p>It is noted the standard manages the potential adverse effects of the proximity of buildings in relation to neighbouring sites, and the potential effects of buildings that are part of a retirement village would be the same as buildings that are not part of a retirement village. The matters of discretion are appropriate for the consideration of resource consent applications for all buildings.</p> <p>It is noted the submitter's requested amendments are dependent upon other requested retirement village-specific provisions being incorporated into the IPI. These requests are recommended for rejection.</p> <p>On this basis there is no justification for the removal of retirement villages from the matters of discretion under TCZ-S3.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.367	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S4	Retain TCZ-S4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-S4.	No
S64.116	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-S4	Seek to amend TCZ-S4 to integrate consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances. Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	The consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances are already provided for via the matters of discretion under TCZ-S4 (Active Frontages). The matters of discretion link with the objectives and policies of the TCZ, and are considered appropriate for the consideration of all resource consent applications that do not comply with the active frontage requirements of TCZ-S4.	No
S58.368	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S5	Amend TCZ-S5 to include the following exclusion to the active frontage standard: Along active frontages identified on the planning maps all residential units must be located above ground floor level, <u>except that residential units may be located on the ground floor where pedestrian access to a residential unit does not interrupt or prevent an active frontage as required by LCZ-S4.</u>	Reject	It is noted it is not only an access to residential units that may interfere with an active frontage, but the residential units themselves. The requested amendment would enable residential units on the ground floor along active frontages - as long as pedestrian access is located elsewhere, such as to the side of a building with an active frontage. This outcome would be contrary to TCZ-P6 - Public Space Interface and Active Street Frontages, and would fail to achieve objective TCZ-O2 – Character and Amenity Values of the Town Centre Zone.  It is appropriate that residential units on the ground floor along active frontages require resource consent to be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No
S64.117	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-S5	Amend TCZ-S5 as follows: 1. Along active frontages identified on the planning maps <u>encourage</u> all residential units <u>and / or retirement units</u> to be located above ground floor level, or allow	Reject	Standard TCZ-S5 manages the location of residential units within the TCZ. The standard <i>requires</i> rather than encourages residential units above ground floor level along active frontages. This is to ensure	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			residential units and / or retirement units to be located on the ground floor where: a. When taking into account individual site characteristics and environments residential units and / or retirement units may be appropriate on the ground floor. Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.		development is consistent with Policies TCZ-P1, TCZ-P2, TCZ-P4, TCZ-P5, TCZ-P6, and consequently, Objectives TCZ-O1 and TCZ-O2 are achieved.  It is noted retirement units would be deemed residential units, and therefore there is no need to include specific reference to retirement units.  The case-by-case consideration of retirement units/residential units at ground floor is most appropriately provided for by restricted discretionary rule TCZ-R12.2 (Location of Residential Units), and discretionary rule TCZ-R19 – Retirement Village.	
S58.369	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S6	Retain TCZ-S6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-S6.	No
S56.58	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-S7	TCZ-S7 Outdoor Living Space Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/ granted.</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.370	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S7	Amend TCZ-S7 to amend the outdoor living space requirements to generally reduce the requirements. See the submission for the specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.118	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	TCZ-S7	Amend TCZ-S7 as follows:..... <u>4. For retirement units, clauses 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</u> (a) <u>the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> (b) <u>a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u> Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion	Reject	TZC-S7 is recommended for replacement in response to submission S58.370. It is considered that any departures from the recommended outdoor living space should be considered on a case-by-case basis by assessing proposals against the matters of discretion under TCZ-S7.  It is considered appropriate that retirement villages within the TCZ – including an proposed outdoor living spaces associated with residential units, are considered holistically as a discretionary activity under Rule TCZ-R19.	No
S58.371	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S8	Retain TCZ-S8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to TCZ-S8.	No
S56.59	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-S9	TCZ-S9 Water Supply, Stormwater, and Wastewater - Amend as follows:  All activities shall comply with the water supply ( <u>including firefighting water supply</u> ), stormwater and wastewater standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.	Reject	As noted within the submission, the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works contains firefighting requirements. On this basis the requested additional text within CCZ-S6 is not necessary.	No
S58.372	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S9	Retain TCZ-S9 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to TCZ-S9 are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S56.53	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ – new objective and policy	<p>Add a new objective and policy as follows:</p> <p><u>TCZ-OX Three Waters Infrastructure</u>  <u>Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Integrated</u></li> <li>• <u>Effective</u></li> <li>• <u>Efficient</u></li> <li>• <u>Functional</u></li> <li>• <u>Safe</u></li> <li>• <u>Sustainable</u></li> <li>• <u>Resilient</u></li> </ul> <p><u>TCZ-PX Three Waters Servicing</u></p> <p>a) <u>All subdivision and development provide integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to their location and intended use.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term, then avoid further intensification until constraints are resolved.</u></p>	Reject	<p>The requested new objective and policy is not necessary as three waters infrastructure provisions and requirements are already in place via subdivision and permitted activity building rules and standards within the zone chapter.</p> <p>It is the role of financial contributions (or development contributions) and infrastructure management planning under the Local Government Act 2002 to address any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity and funding.</p> <p>It is noted the level of permitted activity development enabled by the IPI (as required by the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD) conflicts with the requested policy direction – particularly clause b). with respect to avoiding intensification.</p>	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is</p>	Accept	Submission point S56.63 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.	Accept	Submission point S56.63 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S5.28	Bob Anker	LCZ-Local Centre Zone and MUZ-Mixed Use Zone rules	All of the clauses in local centre and mixed use zone rules which relate to the City Centre Zone are tantamount to restraint of trade provisions and should be removed from the document.	Reject	As detailed in the section 32 evaluation, the purpose of all provisions in the IPI that seek to ensure uses and development in other centres does not undermine the role and function of the City Centre Zone are to give effect to RPS Objective 22 and Policy 30. This is to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of the Upper Hutt sub-regional centre in accordance with RPS Policy 30. The explanatory text to Policy 30 provides additional context as follows:  <i>The range of appropriate land uses to be encouraged through this policy will vary depending on the character and context of each centre. For this reason, policy 30 requires the region's district and city councils to determine the range and location of land uses, supported by appropriate social infrastructure to be encouraged and/or controlled in order to maintain and enhance the viability</i>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p><i>and vibrancy of the relevant centre managed through its district plan.</i></p> <p>The submitter's concern that the purpose of these provisions are for 'anti-competitive restraint of trade' purposes are therefore unfounded.</p>	
S5.29	Bob Anker	LCZ-R5 - R11 and R13 & MUZ-R5-R10	All of these rules contain the same clause favouring the City Centre Zone. Clause should be removed.	Reject	<p>As detailed in the section 32 evaluation, the purpose of all provisions in the IPI that seek to ensure uses and development in other centres does not undermine the role and function of the City Centre Zone are to give effect to RPS Objective 22 and Policy 30. This is to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of the Upper Hutt sub-regional centre in accordance with RPS Policy 30. The explanatory text to Policy 30 provides additional context as follows:</p> <p><i>The range of appropriate land uses to be encouraged through this policy will vary depending on the character and context of each centre. For this reason, policy 30 requires the region's district and city councils to determine the range and location of land uses, supported by appropriate social infrastructure to be encouraged and/or controlled in order to maintain and enhance the viability and vibrancy of the relevant centre managed through its district plan.</i></p> <p>The submitter's concern that the purpose of these provisions are for 'anti-competitive restraint of trade' purposes are therefore unfounded.</p>	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S46.16	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	LCZ	Amend the introductory statement to make reference to the Wallaceville Structure Plan Development Area and the relationship between it and the zone chapter.	Reject	The introductory text for the LCZ is a general description that does not specify the locations of all Local Centre Zones. The IPI mapping clearly identifies a LCZ within the Wallaceville Structure Plan Area, and on this basis it is not necessary to specifically refer to the Wallaceville Structure Plan area or the Gateway Precinct within the LCZ introduction statement.	No
S46.22	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	LCZ	That the District Plan provides for an appropriate range of activities to occur on the site so that development opportunities are not unnecessarily restrained.	Reject	No specific amendments are requested under this submission point. It is noted the Local Centre Zone provisions provide for a range of residential and non-residential activities.	No
S58.140	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ	HRZ Background text - Remove item (viii) from the list, as the High Density Residential Zone should not apply within a walkable catchment of a Local Centre Zone.	Accept	This requested amendment corrects an error. An amendment to correct this is also recommended in response to submission point S5.4 – Bob Anker.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  The relief sought as it is unclear on what basis this relief is sought.	Reject	Submission point S58.140 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  The relief sought as it is unclear on what basis this relief is sought.	Reject	Submission point S58.140 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S58.223	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ	Amend the spatial extent of the LCZ as shown in Appendix 4 of the submission including the spatial extent of Wallaceville LCZ and Trentham North LCZ. See Appendix 4 of the submission	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>for specific requested mapping amendments.</p> <p>If the relief sought in this submission point and Appendix 4 are not granted, the following relief is sought:</p> <p>a. Wallaceville LCZ – amendments consistent with the height variation control sought for the HRZ within a walkable catchment of the CCZ, including 36m height variation on the east side of Ward St.</p>			
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3</p>	Accept	Submission point S58.223 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.224	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ	<p>Amend the spatial extent of the LCZ as shown in Appendix 4 of the submission including removal of the Blue Mountain Campus as a LCZ and changed to MUZ. See Appendix 4 of the submission for specific requested mapping amendments.</p> <p>1. If the relief sought in this submission point and Appendix 4 are not granted, the following relief is sought:</p> <p>a. Blue Mountain Campus –</p>	Reject	<p>The rezoning request is recommended for rejection under submission S58.275 within the 'Rezoning Requests' section of this table below on the basis it is inconsistent with the submission by the owner of the site, and that rezoning to MUZ would enable industrial activities which are likely to result in adverse effects on surrounding residential areas.</p> <p>It is considered to be inappropriate to rezone privately owned properties to Local Centre Zone or Mixed Use Zone in response</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>amendments consistent with the rest of the submission on the LCZ.</p> <p>2. Where a LCZ falls within the walkable catchment of a higher order centre, amend heights as consistent with the heights enabled in the surrounding residential zone and as consistent with height variations shown and sought in Appendix 4 of the submission and this submission point, including applying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Height variation control of 36m to spatial expansion of Wallaceville LCZ on East side of Ward St (walkable catchment of CCZ).</li> <li>(b) Height variation control of 36m to LCZ on Fergusson Dr at Whakatiki St. (walkable catchment of CCZ)</li> <li>(c) Height Variation control of 29m to Silverstream LCZ on Fergusson Dr at Stream Grove (walkable catchment of TCZ).</li> <li>(d) Height variation control of 29m to Trentham LCZ on Fergusson Dr at Islington St (walkable catchment of proposed TCZ).</li> </ul> <p>3. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought. See the submission and its Appendix 4 for further details.</p>		<p>to a submission without direct consultation with all affected property owners and the community.</p> <p>With respect to the requested height variation controls, it is considered the IPI provisions as notified represent the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives, and it is considered that the heights proposed give effect to the requirements of NPS-UD Policy 3(d). The specific permitted heights requested by the submitter are available via restricted discretionary activity resource consent, and this will enable the case-by-case consideration of such proposals. As stated elsewhere in this table in response to the submitter's requested increases to permitted activity building height standards, there are concerns that implementing such a blunt approach would result in a significant increase in the possibility of adverse effects that would be contrary to the objectives of the IPI.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.225	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ Introduction	Retain LCZ - Local Centres Zone - Introduction text as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the LCZ introduction text.	No
S58.238	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ Rule table	Retain LCZ rule table as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the LCZ rule table.	No
S64.78	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ - Local Centre Zone - Introduction	Seek to provide for residential activities (including retirement villages) at the ground floor level if site characteristics / environmental circumstance is deemed to be appropriate (i.e. to be determined on a case-by-case basis).	Reject	The consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances for residential activities at ground level are already provided for via the matters of discretion under LCZ-R12.2. The matters of discretion link with the objectives and policies of the LCZ, and are considered appropriate for the consideration of all resource consent applications on a case-by-case basis that do not comply with the location of residential units requirements of LCZ-S5.	No
S64.127	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Local Centre Zone	Amend rules to provide a permitted activity rule for retirement villages and to provide the following matters of discretion: <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> 1. <u>The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3 and LCZ-S7.</u> 2. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> 3. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> 4. <u>When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: (a) The need to provide</u>	Reject	It is not appropriate to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity within the Local Centre Zone, not it is necessary to include specific matters of discretion within the LCZ chapter for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.  Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the Local Centre Zone as a discretionary activity under Rule LCZ-R19.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>for efficient use of larger sites; and (b) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>5. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>		The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	
S58.226	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-01	Retain LCZ-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S64.79	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-01	Retain LCZ-01 as notified. Note: this submission point was incorrectly attributed to the NCZ, which erroneously duplicates S64.67.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.227	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-02	Amend LCZ-02 to replace reference to 'character and amenity values' with 'planned urban built form'. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD, in addition to the amendments sought in its primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission point S58.227 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD, in addition to the amendments sought in its primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission point S58.227 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S64.80	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-O2	Amend LCZ-O2 as follows: Local Centres are <u>well-functioning safe and attractive</u> urban environments. The built environment is of a scale .....	Reject	Reference to safety and attractiveness within an objective for the LCZ is not considered to be inconsistent with the NPS-UD.  Safety is considered to be a component of a well-functioning urban environment, as it contributes toward enabling people and communities to provide for their social wellbeing and their health and safety (NPS-UD Objective 1).  Although attractiveness is subjective, it is considered to link with the active street frontage provisions.  Reference to 'well-functioning' is recommended for rejection on the basis it is without context i.e. it is the identification of the components of a well-functioning urban environment that is important rather than	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					simply referring to 'well-functioning' in the objective.	
S50.20	Waka Kotahi	NCZ-03, LCZ-03, TCZ-03, and MUZ-03	Amend NCZ-03, LCZ-03, TCZ-03, and MUZ-03 to include reference to provision for, or connection to active and public transport. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The requested reference to 'the provision for or connection to active and public transport' within the objectives is not appropriate as the focus of the objectives is to manage the effects of development within the LCZ at the zone interface with other zones.  The provisions for, or connection to active and public transport is not considered to be a component of the management of effects at the zone interface.	No
S58.228	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-03	Amend LCZ-03 by deleting reference to 'anticipated character' and inserting 'urban' built form. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S72.14	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	LCZO1, LCZ-O3, LCZO4 and LCZ-R3, LCZ-S2 and LCZS3	Local Centre Zone introduction, LCZO1, LCZ-O3, LCZO4 and LCZ-R3, LCZ-S2 and LCZS3 - Include provisions where Tangata Whenua values apply that these standards need to have more space and less or no additional height.	Reject	It is unclear what the specific amendments being sought are to the wording of these provisions.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission point S72.14 is recommended for rejection on the basis that more information is required for the consideration of any amendments to the provision.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and	Accept	Submission point S72.14 is recommended for rejection on the basis that more information is required for the consideration of any amendments to the provision.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.			
S58.230	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P1	Retain LCZ-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the policy are recommended.	No
S58.231	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P2	Retain LCZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-P2.	No
S64.81	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-P2	The RVA seeks to amend LCZ-P2 to remove restrictions on ground level residential activities, and to provide for retirement units: LCZ-P2 Residential activity Provide for residential activity and development where: 1) The residential units <u>or retirement units</u> are located above ground floor, where located along an active frontage identified on the planning maps, <u>or above ground floor where appropriate...</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S56.40	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-P3	LCZ-P3 Other activities - Amend as follows: <u>6. There is a functional and operational need for the activity to locate in the Local Centre Zone.</u>	Reject	The list of criteria contained within the policy is a holistic list – meaning all proposed 'other activities' will be considered against all subclauses in the policy. The proposed inclusion of a clause to refer to a functional and operation need for an activity to be located in the Local Centre Zone will have the unintended consequence of raising likelihood of other activities being deemed to be inconsistent with the policy on account of a lack of a demonstrated operational or functional need to be located within the LCZ.  It is noted emergency service facilities are already subject to the consideration of the	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					functional and operations need to be located within the LCZ as a matter of discretion under rule LCZ-R14.	
S58.232	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P3	Retain LCZ-P3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-P3.	No
S58.233	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P4	Retain LCZ-P4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-P4.	No
S64.82	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-P4	Amend LCZ-P4 to clarify that activities covered by LCZ-P2 are compatible.	Reject	<p>The compatibility of activities is determined through a combination of the activity status of a proposed activity, its' actual and potential effects on the environment, and its consistency with the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan and any other relevant higher-order statutory planning documents such as the RPS and National Policy Statements.</p> <p>It is not the role of Policy LCZ-P4 to attempt to specifically identify all activities that would be compatible within the Local Centre Zone on all sites within the zone.</p>	No
S58.234	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P5	Amend LCZ-P5 by inserting 'urban' into point 1. See the submission for specific requested amendment.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.83	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-P5(clause 4)	<p>Amend LCZ-P5(4) as follows:  Provide for medium-density development that  ...  4. <del>is well designed</del> and contributes to an attractive a well-functioning urban environment.</p>	Accept in part	<p>The reference to "attractive" links with objective LCZ-O2 – as addressed under submission S64.80 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to refer to 'well-functioning urban environment, as this links with Strategic Direction Objective CMU-O1. However, it is not considered necessary to</p>	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					delete reference to the LCZ being well designed, as good design within the LCZ will be necessary to achieve objective LCZ-O2 – Character and Amenity Values of the Local Centre Zone, and LCZ-O3 – Managing Effects at the Zone Interface.  It is recommended to amend clause 4 of policy LCZ-P5 as follows:  4. Is well designed and contributes to an attractive <u>well-functioning</u> urban environment; and	
S58.235	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P6	Retain LCZ-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.236	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P7	Retain LCZ-P7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S56.41	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-R1 & MUZ-R1	LCZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-R1 or MUZ-R1.	No
S58.239	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R1	Amend the notification preclusion of rule LCZ-R1 to add LCZ-S1 (Height) and delete LCZ-S4 (Active Frontage) from the public notification preclusion clause, and add LCZ-S4 (Active Frontage), LCZ-S9 (Water Supply, Stormwater and Wastewater), and LCZ-S10 (Hydraulic Neutrality) to the public notification and limited notification preclusion clause.	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is	Accept in part	It is recommended the further submission's partial opposition be accepted on the basis that submission point S58.239 is recommended for rejection, while the	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.		further submitter's partial support be rejected.	
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	It is recommended the further submission's partial opposition be accepted on the basis that submission point S58.239 is recommended for rejection, while the further submitter's partial support be rejected.	N/A
S64.84	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-R1	Amend LCZ-R1 as follows: ... <u>5. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where:</u> <u>c) Compliance is not achieved with LCZ-R1-1.a or LCZ-R1-1.b, or compliance is not achieved with one or more of the standards under LCZ-R1-1.c, and the activity is for the construction of buildings for a retirement village.</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> 1. <u>The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3 and LCZ-S7.</u> 2. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> 3. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the</u>	Reject	It is not necessary to add matters of discretion to rule LCZ-R1 for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.  Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the Local Centre Zone as a discretionary activity under Rule LCZ-R19.  The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>4. <u>When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: (a) The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and (b) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>5. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>		consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	
S58.240	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R2	Retain LCZ-R2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.241	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R3	Retain LCZ-R3 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment to add an advice note to LCZ-R3 is recommended in response to submission S72.12 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	No
S58.242	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R4	Retain LCZ-R4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S46.17	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	LCZ-R5	Amend Rule LCZ-R5.1.a to provide an exemption for the Wallaceville Structure Plan Development Area.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.243	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R5	Retain LCZ-R5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-R5.	No
S58.244	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R6	Retain LCZ-R6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.245	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R7	Retain LCZ-R7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.246	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R8	Retain LCZ-R8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S51.9	Ministry of Education	LCZ-R9	Rule LCZ – R9 Retain as proposed.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.247	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R9	Retain LCZ-R9 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S46.18	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	LCZ-R10	Amend Rule LCZ-R10.1.a to provide an exemption for the Wallaceville Structure Plan Development Area.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.248	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R10	Retain LCZ-R10 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-R10.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.249	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R11	Retain LCZ-R11 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-R11.	No
S58.250	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R12	Amend LCZ-R12 to: 1. Delete standard 1.(a) that limits the number of residential units to 6 per site. 2. Delete Standard 2.(a) that specifies the matters of discretion that apply where compliance with standard 1.(a) is not achieved. 3. 3. Make consequential amendments. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The limitation on the number of residential units is to enable the consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects, and the consideration of potential privacy effects on adjoining residential zones.	No
S58.251	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R13	Retain LCZ-R13 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S56.42	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-R14	LCZ-R14 Emergency Service Facility - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.252	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R14	Retain LCZ-R14 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.253	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R15	Retain LCZ-R15 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.254	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R16	Retain LCZ-R16 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.255	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R17	Retain LCZ-R17 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.256	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R18	Retain LCZ-R18 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.257	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R19	Retain LCZ-R19 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-R19.	No
S64.85	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-R19	Amend LCZ-R19 as follows: LCZ-R19 Retirement Village 1. Activity status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u>	Reject	Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the Local Centre Zone as a discretionary activity under Rule LCZ-R19.  The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages within the Local Centre Zone (and all zones) on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	No
OPPOSED* BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi  * Note – the further submission states 'Oppose and seek amendment', however the further submission seeks submission point S64.85 be disallowed.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes retirement villages as a Permitted activity as they can have significant effect on the transport network, and therefore a full consideration of how such effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated is required through a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Accept	Submission point S64.85 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.258	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R20	Retain LCZ-R20 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.259	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R21	Retain LCZ-R21 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.260	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R22	Retain LCZ-R22 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.261	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R23	Retain LCZ-R23 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.262	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R24	Retain LCZ-R24 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.263	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-R25	Retain LCZ-R25 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.264	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S1	Retain LCZ-S1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-S1.	No
S64.86	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-S1	Amend standard LCZ-S1 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	LCZ-S1 is the permitted height standard for all buildings within the LCZ. The matters of discretion address the potential adverse effects of buildings exceeding the maximum permitted height standard – including shading and loss of privacy for neighbouring residential or open space and recreation zone sites.  There is no reasonable effects-based justification for excluding buildings that are	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					part of a retirement village from the matters of discretion.	
S58.265	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S2	Amend LCZ-S2 by: (1) deleting the reference to the Open Space and Recreation Zone. (2). Amend the recession plane standard 1.(a) by limiting its applicability to where the boundary adjoins a site zoned Medium Density Residential Zone. (3). Insert a new clause (b) to standard 1. as follows: <u>b. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all boundaries, where that boundary adjoins a site zoned High Density Residential Zone.</u> The submission seeks that a diagram consistent with this requested new clause be added to the standard - no diagram is provided by the submitter. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.87	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-S2	Amend LCZ-S2 as follows: Where the side or rear boundary of a site adjoins a Residential Zone or <del>Open Space and Recreation Zone</del> the following Height in Relation to Boundary standard applies: Also amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	Buildings within the LCZ that encroach the height in relation to boundary standard have the potential to adversely affect the use of buildings and land within the Open Space and Recreation Zone.  Buildings that are part of a retirement village can result in the same effects as any other building within the LCZ.  The submitter's other requests to amend the IPI to include retirement village-specific rules is recommended for rejection under other submission points. In the absence of these other rules, the submitter's request to exclude retirement villages from matters of	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					discretion under standards would result in a gap in the management of buildings that are part of a retirement village.	
S56.43	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-S3	<p>LCZ-S3 Setback - Add advice note:  <u>Advice note:</u>  <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p> <p><u>Add new matter of discretion:</u>  <u>5. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u></p>	Reject	<p>It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.</p> <p>With respect to the requested new matter of discretion to standard LCZ-S3, it is noted the standard specifies the boundary setback requirements for buildings where the site adjoins a High Density Residential Zone, General Residential Zone, or Open Space Zone. The matters of discretion under the applicable building rules (such as LCZ-R1.2) do not relate to health and safety matters such as emergency services access, as those are already managed under the requirements of the Building Code. The requested matter of discretion would have the effect of introducing a matter of discretion that is already effectively managed via other methods – i.e. the building consent process. It is not recommended to introduce any regulatory overlap between the District Plan and the Building Code. Therefore, although the concerns of the submitter are acknowledged, it is recommended this</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					request be rejected on the basis the District Plan is not the most appropriate method to address the matters raised by the submitter.	
S58.266	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S3	Retain LCZ-S3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-S3.	No
S64.88	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-S3	Amend standard LCZ-S3 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	Retirement villages are specifically provided for as a discretionary activity via rule LCZ-19.  Depending on the location and layout of a proposed retirement village within the LCZ with respect to adjoining residential or open spaced zoned site, LCZ-S3 – Setback, may be a relevant consideration for a resource consent application under rule LCZ-R19..	No
S58.267	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S4	Retain LCZ-S4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-S4.	No
S64.89	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-S4	Amend standard LCZ-S4 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	Retirement villages are specifically provided for as a discretionary activity via rule LCZ-19.  Depending on the location and layout of a proposed retirement village within the LCZ, and the location of non-residential uses with respect to active frontages, LCZ-S4 – Active Frontages, may be a relevant consideration for a resource consent application under rule LCZ-R19.	No
S58.268	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S5	Amend LCZ-S5 - Location of Residential Units, by adding the following to the standard: Along active frontages identified on the	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			planning maps all residential units must be located above ground floor level, <u>except that residential units may be located on the ground floor where pedestrian access to a residential unit does not interrupt or prevent an active frontage as required by LCZ-S4.</u>			
S64.90	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-S5	Amend LCZ-S5 as follows: 1. Along active frontages identified on the planning maps all residential units <u>and / or retirement units</u> must be located above ground floor level, <u>except that residential units and / or retirement units may be located on the ground floor where: a. When taking into account individual site characteristics and environments residential units and / or retirement units may be appropriate on the ground floor.</u> Also amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	Retirement units that are part of a retirement village require resource consent as a discretionary activity via rule LCZ-19. Retirement units at ground floor along an identified active frontage could result in effects and outcomes that are contrary to objective LCZ-O1, and policies LCZ-P1 – Appropriate Activities, LCZ-P2 – Residential Activity, and LCZ-P6 – Public Space Interface and Active Street Frontages.  It is noted the consideration of individual site characteristic and environments is already provided for via the resource consent process under rule LCZ-R19.	No
S46.19	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	LCZ-S6	Exempt the Gateway Precinct from the requirements of Standard LCZ-S6.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.269	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S6	Retain LCZ-S6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-S6.	No
S56.44	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-S7	LCZ-S7 Outdoor Living Space - Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Site layout requirements are further</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>		firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	
S58.270	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S7	Delete LCZ-S7 and replace it with the submitter's requested wording that provides for smaller outdoor living spaces. See the submission for the specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.91	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	LCZ-S7	<u>Amend LCZ-S7 as follows to..... 5. For retirement units, clauses 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications: a) the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and b) a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u> Also amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	LZC-S7 is recommended for replacement in response to submission S58.270. It is considered that any departures from the recommended outdoor living space should be considered on a case-by-case basis by assessing proposals against the matters of discretion under LCZ-S7.  It is considered appropriate that retirement villages within the LCZ – including any proposes outdoor living space, are considered holistically as a discretionary activity under Rule LCZ-R19.	No
S46.20	Blue Mountains Campus Development	LCZ-S8	Provide an exemption to the standard in relation to Lots 2, 3 and 252 of the Urban Precinct.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Limited Partnership					
S58.271	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S8	Retain LCZ-S8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-S8.	No
S56.45	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-S9	LCZ-S9 Water Supply, Stormwater and Wastewater Amend as follows: All activities shall comply with the water supply ( <u>including firefighting water supply</u> ), stormwater and wastewater standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.	Reject	As noted within the submission, the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works contains firefighting requirements. On this basis the requested additional text within CCZ-S6 is not necessary.	No
S58.272	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S9	Retain LCZ-S9 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to LCZ-S9.	No
S56.39	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ – new objective and policy	Add a new objective and policy as follows: <u>LCZ-OX Three Waters Infrastructure Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Integrated</u></li> <li>• <u>Effective</u></li> <li>• <u>Efficient</u></li> <li>• <u>Functional</u></li> <li>• <u>Safe</u></li> <li>• <u>Sustainable</u></li> <li>• <u>Resilient</u></li> </ul> <u>LCZ-PX Three Waters Servicing</u> a) <u>All subdivision and development provide integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to their location and intended use.</u>	Reject	The requested new objective and policy is not necessary as three waters infrastructure provisions and requirements are already in place via subdivision and permitted activity building rules and standards within the zone chapter.  It is the role of financial contributions (or development contributions) and infrastructure management planning under the Local Government Act 2002 to address any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity and funding.  It is noted the level of permitted activity development enabled by the IPI (as required by the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD) conflicts with the requested policy direction – particularly clause b). with respect to avoiding intensification.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			b) <u>Where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term, then avoid further intensification until constraints are resolved.</u>			
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.	Accept	Submission point S56.39 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.	Accept	Submission point S56.39 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S5.27	Bob Anker	NCZ	Where a Centre Zone falls within the catchment created by the presence of a station then it needs to be clarified if we are dealing with a separate enclave and if so which set of rules predominates.	Reject	All centre zones are identified and managed via their own set of zone-specific provisions. No zone cross-over has been identified on the IPI Planning Maps.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S27.29	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NCZ	Retain the direction in respect of qualifying matter areas included in the new Advice Note.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the advice note.	No
S58.172	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ	Retain NCZ in walkable catchment of higher-order Centre as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the location of any Neighbourhood Centre Zones.	No
S58.173	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ Introduction	Amend NCZ Introduction by deleting text the submitter considers too detailed and unnecessary. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.185	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ - Rules Advice Note	Retain NCZ - Rules Advice Note as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the NCZ rules advice note.	No
S64.66	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ	Amended Neighbourhood Centre introduction as follows: NCZ – Neighbourhood Centre Zone The Neighbourhood Centre Zone provides for a range of small scale commercial activities that service the day-to-day needs of the immediate residential neighbourhood. Neighbourhood Centres accommodate a range of commercial, retail, and community services, and <u>residential activities</u> , and provide a limited range of services, and employment <del>and living</del> opportunities ..... Residential activities units are located either above the ground floor or towards the rear of the site <u>or at ground floor where appropriate.</u>	Reject	It is recommended to reject this submission point for the following reasons:  1. <i>Residential activities</i> are adequately captured by the reference to 'living opportunities'. 2. The requested addition to the description of where residential activities are provided for within the NCZ is already captured by reference to 'or towards the rear of the site. The provision of residential activities within the NCZ is described in NCZ-P2, and enabled by rule NCZ-R8 where compliance with NCZ-S5 is achieved (location of residential units). To be a permitted activity, residential units must be located above ground floor, or on ground floor where no part of the residential unit fronts onto a public open space, including roads,	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					and they do not prevent or interrupt an active frontage.	
S72.8	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	NCZ Introduction	NCZ Introduction to chapter - Rephrase the introduction to reflect the visibility of Tangata Whenua in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, as well as how they see commercial spaces to reflect their economic aspirations.	Reject	It is unclear what specific amendments are sought to the introduction text of the NCZ.  The submitter may wish to provide more information at the hearing to enable the consideration of the requested rephrasing to address Tangata Whenua views and economic aspirations.	No
S58.174	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-01	Retain NCZ-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-01.	No
S64.67	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-01	Retain NCZ-01 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-01.	No
S72.9	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	NCZ-01	NCZ-01 - Purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone - Recraft the Objective to reflect the purpose of the NCZ is also to increase the visibility of Tangata Whenua and ensure Tangata Whenua's kaitiakitanga role over the whenua is spelled out.	Reject	It is unclear what specific amendments are sought to NCZ-01.  The submitter may wish to provide more information at the hearing to enable the consideration of specific amendments to address Tangata Whenua visibility and to ensure Tangata Whenua's kaitiakitanga role over the whenua is spelled out.	No
S58.175	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-02	Amend NCZ-02 to refer to 'planned urban built form', and 'surrounding residential development. Delete reference to 'anticipated built character'. See the submission for requested relief.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.68	Retirement Villages	NCZ-02	Amend NCZ-02 as follows: Built development in the Neighbourhood	Reject	It is recommended to reject this submission point for the following reasons:	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Association of New Zealand		Centre Zone is of medium density and <del>reflects</del> <u>responds</u> to the anticipated built character of the surrounding residential neighbourhood. <del>It is well designed and contributes positively to the residential environment.</del>		It is considered appropriate to retain the reference to <i>reflects</i> rather than replace this with <i>responds</i> . The planned urban built form (as per NPS-UD Policy 6(a)) is that which is enabled and provided for by the IPI. It is considered appropriate that built development reflects the planned urban built form.  The proposed deletion of the sentence ' <i>It is well-designed and contributes positively to the residential environment</i> ', would result in a disconnect between NCZ-O2 and the direction of policies NCZ-P5 – Built Development, and NCZ-P7 – Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones.	
S58.176	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-O3	Retain NZC-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-O3.	No
S72.10	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	NCZ-O3	NCZ-O3 Managing effects at the Zone Interface - Caveat the proposition in the Objective to say: <i>have no adverse effects if the site's amenity values are embedded with cultural values and are taonga to Tangata Whenua.</i>	Reject	It is considered the requested amendments will not be effective in the absence of a holistic plan change that addresses Tangata Whenua values and sites and areas of significance to Māori.  In addition, it is unclear what specific wording amendments to NCZ-O3 are sought by the submitter. The submitter may wish to provide more information at the hearing to enable the consideration of specific amendments to address the submitter's concerns.	No
S58.177	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P1	Amend NCZ-P1 to refer to the 'planned urban built form'. Delete reference to	Accept	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			'character'. See the submission for requested amendments.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point to the extent it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Accept	Submission point S58.177 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
	SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Accept	Submission point S58.177 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S58.178	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P2	Retain NCZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-P2.	No
S64.69	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-P2	Amend NCZ-P2 as follows: NCZ-P2 Residential Activity Provide for residential activity where: 1. The residential units or retirement units are located either above ground floor or to the rear of a commercial activity, <u>or above ground floor where appropriate...</u>	Reject	The requested addition to policy NCZ-P2 regarding where residential activities are provided for within the NCZ is already captured by reference to 'or towards the rear of a commercial activity'.  The provision of residential activities within the NCZ as described in NCZ-P2 is enabled by rule NCZ-R8 where compliance with NCZ-S5 is achieved (location of residential units). To be a permitted activity, residential units must be located above ground floor, or on ground floor where no part of the residential unit fronts onto a public open space, including roads, and they do not prevent or interrupt an active frontage.  On this basis the submission point is recommended for rejection.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S56.33	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ-P3	NCZ-P3 Other activities - Amend as follows: <u>6. There is a functional and operational need for the activity to locate in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.</u>	Reject	<p>The list of criteria contained within the policy is a holistic list – meaning all proposed 'other activities' will be considered against all subclauses in the policy. The proposed inclusion of a clause to refer to a functional and operation need for an activity to be located in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone will have the unintended consequence of raising likelihood of other activities being deemed to be inconsistent with the policy on account of a lack of a demonstrated operational or functional need to be located within the NCZ.</p> <p>It is noted emergency service facilities are already subject to the consideration of the functional and operations need to be located within the NCZ as a matter of discretion under rule NCZ-R11.</p>	No
S58.179	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P3	Amend NCZ-P3 to refer to 'planned urban built form'. Delete reference to 'anticipated character'. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	<p>It is considered the requested amendments to NCZ-P3 will improve the policy's consistency with Policy 6(a) of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>It is recommended to amend NCZ-P3 as follows:</p> <p><i>Only allow for other <b>activities</b>, including larger scale <b>commercial and retail activities</b> where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ...;</li> <li>2. <i>The scale and intensity of the <b>activity</b> is consistent with the <del>anticipated character</del> <u>planned urban built form and function</u></i></li> </ol>	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p><i>of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone;</i></p> <p><b>Section 32AA evaluation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The recommended amendments to NCZ-P3 will better align with the direction of NPS-UD regarding the consideration of the planned urban built form. The amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the IPI.</li> <li>2. The recommended amendments to NCZ-P3 will not have any greater environmental, social, or cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits for plan implementation as a result of improved plan alignment with national direction, and the removal of potential conflict between the NPS-UD and these provisions.</li> </ol>	
	SUPPORTED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point to the extent it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Accept	Submission point S58.179 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
	SUPPORTED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Accept	Submission point S58.179 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.180	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P4	Retain NCZ-P4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-P4	No
S64.70	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-P4	Amend NCZ-P4 to clarify that activities covered by NCZ-P2 are compatible.	Reject	<p>The compatibility of activities is determined through a combination of the activity status of a proposed activity, its' actual and potential effects on the environment, and its consistency with the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan and any other relevant higher-order statutory planning documents such as the RPS and National Policy Statements.</p> <p>It is not the role of Policy NCZ-P4 to attempt to specifically identify all activities that would be compatible within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone on all sites within the zone.</p>	No
S58.181	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P5	Amend NCZ-P5 to refer to 'urban' built form. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	<p>The requested amendment improves alignment of the terminology used in the NPS-UD.</p> <p>It is recommended to amend clause 1 of policy NCZ-P5 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects the purpose and is consistent with the anticipated density and planned built <u>urban</u> form of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone;</li> </ol> <p><b>Section 32AA evaluation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recommended amendments to NCZ-P5 will better align with the direction of NPS-UD regarding the consideration of the planned urban built</li> </ol>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>form. The amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the IPI.</p> <p>2. The recommended amendments to NCZ-P5 will not have any greater environmental, social, or cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits for plan implementation as a result of improved plan alignment with national direction, and the removal of potential conflict between the NPS-UD and these provisions.</p>	
S58.182	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P6	Retain NCZ-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the policy are recommended.	No
S58.183	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P7	Retain NCZ-P7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the policy are recommended.	No
S56.34	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ-R1	NCZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-R1.	No
S58.186	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R1	Amend NCZ-R1 to add additional standards to the preclusion to public notification and limited notification provisions by: 1. adding NCZ-S1 - Height, and deleting NZC-S4-Active Frontages from the public notification preclusion; and 2. Adding NCZ-S4 - Active Frontages, NCZ-S9 - Water Supply, Stormwater, and Wastewater, and NCZ-S10 - Hydraulic Neutrality to the public and limited	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			notification preclusion provisions. See the submission for specific amendments to the notification preclusion provisions.			
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial opposition is recommended for acceptance, while the partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis S58.186 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	The further submitter's partial opposition is recommended for acceptance, while the partial support is recommended for rejection on the basis S58.186 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S64.71	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-R1	Seek that NCZ-R1 is amended as follows <u>4..... Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: b) Compliance is not achieved with NCZ-R1-1.a or NCZ-R1-1.b, or compliance is not achieved with NCZ-R1-1.c, and the activity is for the construction of buildings for a retirement village. Matters of discretion are restricted to: (1) The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2, NCZ-S3 and NCZ-S7. (2) The effects of the retirement</u>	Reject	It is not necessary to include specific provisions within rule NCZ-R1 for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.  Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the Neighbourhood	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; (3) The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; (4) When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: (a) The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and (b) The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. (5) The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village. Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2 and NCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>		Centre Zone as a discretionary activity under Rule NCZ-R18.  The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	
S58.187	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R2	Retain NCZ-R2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.188	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R3	Retain NCZ-R3 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment is recommended to NCZ-R3 in response to submission S72.12 – Ngāti Toa.	No
S72.12	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	NCZ-R3	NCZ-R3 Demolition - Add wording to ensure, demolition as permitted activity does not negatively impact or have unintended consequences for SASMs or	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			any other Tangata Whenua value on site.			
S58.189	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R4	Amend NCZ-R4 to include reference to Local Centre Zone and the Town Centre Zone. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.190	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R5	Retain NCZ-R5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.191	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R6	Retain NCZ-R6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.192	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R7	Retain NCZ-R7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.193	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R8	Retain NCZ-R8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.194	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R9	Retain NCZ-R9 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S51.8	Ministry of Education	NCZ-R10	Retain NCZ-R10 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.195	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R10	Retain NCZ-R10 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S56.35	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ-R11	NCZ-R11 Emergency Service Facility - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.196	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R11	Retain NCZ-R11 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.197	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R12	Retain NCZ-R12 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.198	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R13	Retain NCZ-R13 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.199	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R14	Retain NCZ-R14 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.200	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R15	Retain NCZ-R15 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.201	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R16	Retain NCZ-R16 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.202	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R17	Retain NCZ-R17 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.203	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R18	Retain NCZ-R18 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-R18.	No
S64.72	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-R18	Amend NCZ-R18 as follows: NCZ-R18 Retirement Village 1. Activity status: <del>Discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u> .	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED* BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi * Note – the further submission states 'Oppose and seek amendment', however the further submission seeks submission point S64.72 be disallowed.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes retirement villages as a Permitted activity as they can have significant effect on the transport network, and therefore a full consideration of how such effects can be	Accept	Submission point S64.72 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			avoided, remedied or mitigated is required through a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status.			
S58.204	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R19	Retain NCZ-R19 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.205	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R20	Retain NCZ-R20 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.206	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R21	Retain NCZ-R21 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.207	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R22	Retain NCZ-R22 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.208	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R23	Retain NCZ-R23 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.209	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-R24	Retain NCZ-R24 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.210	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S1	Retain NCZ-S1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-S1.	No
S64.73	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-S1	Amend NCZ-S1 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	NCZ-S1 is the permitted height standard for all buildings within the NCZ. The matters of discretion address the potential adverse effects of buildings exceeding the maximum permitted height standard – including shading and loss of privacy for neighbouring residential or open space and recreation zone sites.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					There is no reasonable justification for excluding buildings that are part of a retirement village from the matters of discretion.	
S58.211	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S2	Amend NCZ-S2 - Height in Relation to Boundary as follows: 1. Buildings must not project beyond a: a. 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, <u>where that boundary adjoins a site zoned Medium Density Residential Zone or Open Space and Recreation Zone,</u> as shown on the following diagram, <u>or</u> b. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all boundaries, <u>where that boundary adjoins a site zoned High Density Residential Zone.</u> The submitter also seeks that a diagram consistent with submission point (b) above is added to this standard. See the submission for requested relief.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.74	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-S2	Amend standard NCZ-S2 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.  Amend standard NCZ-S2 as follows: Where the side or rear boundary of a site adjoins a Residential Zone <del>or Open Space and Recreation Zone</del> the following Height in Relation to Boundary standard applies: ...	Reject	NCZ-S2 is the height in relation to boundary standard for buildings that adjoin a residential zone or the Open Space and Recreation Zone. All buildings that exceed the height in relation to building standard have the potential to adversely affect adjoining residential or open space zoned sites – regardless of whether the buildings are within a retirement village or not.  There is no reasonable justification for excluding buildings that are part of a	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					retirement village from the matters of discretion.	
S72.13	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	NCZ-S2	NCZ-S2 - Height in relation to boundary NCZ-S3 Setback - Include provisions where Tangata Whenua values apply that these standards need to have more space and less or no additional height.	Reject	The submission does not include specific requested amendments or sufficient information to justify reducing these standards, however the submitter may wish to provide more information during the hearing to enable the consideration specific requested amendments.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission point S72.13 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission point S72.13 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S56.36	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ-S3	NCZ-S3 Setback - Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u> <u>Add new matter of discretion:</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.  With respect to the requested new matter of discretion to standard NCZ-S2, it is noted	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>5. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u>		the standard specifies the boundary setback requirements for buildings where the site adjoins a High Density Residential Zone, General Residential Zone, or Open Space Zone. The matters of discretion under the applicable building rules (such as NCZ-R1.2) do not relate to health and safety matters such as emergency services access, as those are already managed under the requirements of the Building Code. The requested matter of discretion would have the effect of introducing a matter of discretion that is already effectively managed via other methods – i.e. the building consent process. It is not recommended to introduce any regulatory overlap between the District Plan and the Building Code. Therefore, although the concerns of the submitter are acknowledged, it is recommended this request be rejected on the basis the District Plan is not the most appropriate method to address the matters raised by the submitter.	
S58.212	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S3	Delete NZC-S3.	Reject	The setback of buildings within the NCZ from a side or rear boundary of a site that adjoins a residential zone or Open Space and Recreation Zone is an important mitigating standard to manage the effects of use and development within the NCZ at the zone interface.	No
S58.213	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S3	Retain NZC-S4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-S4.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.75	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-S4	Amend standard NCZ-S4 to exclude retirement villages for the matters of discretion.	Reject	This submission point is recommended for rejection as retirement villages are subject to a specific discretionary rule NCZ-R18 within the NCZ.	No
S58.214	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S5	Amend NCZ-S5 to change standard 1(b) to refer to 'Pedestrian access to a residential unit does not', rather than 'They do not'. See the submission for specific requested relief.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S64.76	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-S5	Amend NCZ-S5 to remove restrictions on ground level residential activities and provide for consideration of ground level residential activities on a case-by-case basis, and to provide for retirement units. NCZ-S5 Location of Residential Units 1. All residential units <u>and / or retirement units</u> must be located above ground floor level..... a. No part of the residential unit <u>and / or retirement unit</u> fronts onto a public open space, including roads; and b. They do not interrupt or prevent an active frontage as required by NCZ-S4; and <u>c. When taking into account individual site characteristics and environments residential units and / or retirement units may be appropriate on the ground floor.</u> Also amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	It is noted retirement units would be deemed residential units, and therefore there is no need to include specific reference to retirement units.  The case-by-case consideration of retirement units/residential units at ground floor is most appropriately provided for by restricted discretionary rule NCZ-R8.2 (Residential Activity), and discretionary rule LCZ-R18 – Retirement Village.  Retirement villages are subject to discretionary rule LCZ-R18, and on this basis it is not necessary or appropriate to remove retirement villages from the matters of discretion within NCZ-S5.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.215	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S6	Retain NCZ-S6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the standard are recommended.	No
S56.37	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ-S7	NCZ-S7 Outdoor Living Space - Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/ granted.</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	No
S58.216	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S7	Delete NCZ-S7 and replace it with the submitter's requested version that provides for reduced minimum outdoor living space. See the submission for the specific requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.77	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-S7	Amend NCZ-S7 as follows:... <u>4. For retirement units, clauses 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications: a) the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and b) a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>	Reject	NCZ-S7 is recommended for replacement in response to submission S58.216. It is considered that any departures from the recommended outdoor living space should be considered on a case-by-case basis by assessing proposals against the matters of discretion under NCZ-S7.  It is considered appropriate that retirement villages within the NCZ – including any proposes outdoor living space, are considered holistically as a discretionary activity under Rule NCZ-R18.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Also amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.			
S58.217	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S8	Retain NCZ-S8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the standard are recommended.	No
S56.38	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ-S9	NCZ-S9 Water Supply, Stormwater and Wastewater - Amend as follows: All activities must comply with the water supply ( <u>including firefighting water supply</u> ), stormwater and wastewater standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.	Reject	As noted within the submission, the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works contains firefighting requirements. On this basis the requested additional text within CCZ-S6 is not necessary.	No
S58.218	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S9	Retain NCZ-S9 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to NCZ-S9.	No
S27.30	Transpower New Zealand Limited	NCZ-SSC-S1	Amend NCZ-SSC-S1(1)(c) as follows: "c. Minimum <u>sensitive activity</u> , building and <u>structure</u> setback from the power pylon and electricity transmission lines <del>on the site...</del> "	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.222	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-SSC-S1 to NCZ-SSC-S4	Delete NCZ-SSC-S1 to NCZ-SSC-S4.	Reject	The requested deletion of standards NCZ-SSC-S1-S4 is recommended for rejection as these standards are existing site specific provisions in the District Plan, and neither the NPS-UD or the MDRS require the Council to amend these provisions. Specifically, it is noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NNC-SSC-S1 duplicates existing district plan site-specific boundary setback standards under COMZ-S2.</li> <li>2. NNC-SSC-S2 duplicates the existing district plan site-specific coverage standard under COMZ-S5.</li> </ul>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>3. NNC-SSC-S3 duplicates the existing district plan site-specific screening standard under COMZ-S8.</p> <p>4. NNZ-SSC-S4 duplicates the existing district plan site-specific landscaping standard under COMZ-S9.</p>	
S58.220	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-SSC-R1	Delete NCZ-SSC-R1.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.221	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-SSC-R2	Delete NCZ-SSC-R2.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S43.14	KiwiRail	Objectives and policies in NCZ, LCZ, MUZ, TCZ, and CCZ	<p>Insert a new objective and policy into the NCZ, LCZ, MUZ, TCZ, CCZ and any other zones affected by the IPI that adjoins the railway corridor as follows:  <u>OX. Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</u></p> <p>Add new policy as follows:  <u>PX. Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network utilities to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of those utilities and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u></p> <p>Alternatively, the existing objectives and policies in each zone be amended to provide appropriate policy direction to manage the safety of the rail corridor and the communities who live nearby.</p>	Reject	<p>The requested relief forms part of a suite of requested amendments by the submitter for the creation of specific provisions to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on the rail corridor. This would require the application of a new qualifying matter to apply within all zones on sites in proximity to the rail corridor to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operation of the rail corridor.</p> <p>There is insufficient information contained in the submission to consider the creation of a new qualifying matter and requested supporting provisions such as the objective and policy under this submission point.</p> <p>The application of a new qualifying matter within all relevant zones must be carried out in accordance with Section 77I of the RMA, which lists the relevant qualifying matters. The requested suite of reverse sensitivity provisions need to be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>Sections 77I, 77J, 77O, 77P, and 77R of the RMA. There is insufficient information included with the submission to consider a new qualifying matter for the management of reverse sensitivity effects on the rail corridor.</p> <p>The submitter may wish to present more information at the hearing to enable the consideration of the application of a new qualifying matter to address reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	
OPPOSED BY: FS6 – Transpower New Zealand Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Transpower notes that the relief sought would also provide direction in respect of effects on the National Grid and as such Transpower is concerned that the wording of the provisions proposed by the submitter does not give effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET (insofar as the proposed provisions relate to the National Grid).</p> <p>Transpower’s concerns can be resolved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amending the relief sought so that the proposed provisions give effect to the NPSET; or, alternatively,</li> <li>• amending the relief sought to be specific to the rail network.</li> </ul> <p>Transpower’s initial preference is for the latter solution (SEE FURTHER SUBMISSION FOR REQUESTED AMENDMENTS)</p>	Accept	Submission point S43.14 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes submission point S43.14 (in particular the proposed objective) as it is unclear what an 'appropriate scale and location' would be considered.	Accept	Submission point S43.14 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
			OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes submission point S43.14 (in particular the proposed objective) as it is unclear what an 'appropriate scale and location' would be considered.	Accept	Submission point S43.14 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S50.21	Waka Kotahi	NCZ-P1, LCZ-P1, TCZ-P1, and MUZ-P1	Amend NCZ-P1, LCZ-P1, TCZ-P1, and MUZ-P1 to include reference to 'with access to active and public transport'. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	Although some of these centres may have access to public transport, this is not necessarily the case for all centres. Proximity to public transport is not a criterion used in the selection of the most appropriate centre zoning within the centres hierarchy. Access to active and public transport is also not a criterion used in specifying appropriate activities within the centres zones.  The submission point is therefore recommended for rejection.	No
S56.32	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	NCZ – new objective and policy	Add a new objective and policy as follows: <u>NCZ-OX Three Waters Infrastructure</u> <u>Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u> <u>Integrated</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Effective</u></li> <li>• <u>Efficient</u></li> <li>• <u>Functional</u></li> </ul>	Reject	The requested new objective and policy is not necessary as three waters infrastructure provisions and requirements are already in place via subdivision and permitted activity building rules and standards within the zone chapters and the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport chapter.  It is the role of financial contributions (or development contributions) and infrastructure management planning under	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Safe</u></li> <li>• <u>Sustainable</u></li> <li>• <u>Resilient</u></li> </ul> <p><u>NCZ-PX Three Waters Servicing</u></p> <p>a) <u>All subdivision and development provide integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to their location and intended use.</u></p> <p>b) <u>Where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term, then avoid further intensification until constraints are resolved.</u></p>		<p>the Local Government Act 2002 to address any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity and funding.</p> <p>It is noted the level of permitted activity development enabled by the IPI (as required by the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD) conflicts with the requested policy direction – particularly clause b). with respect to avoiding intensification.</p>	
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.</p>	Accept	Submission point S56.32 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate</p>	Accept	Submission point S56.32 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.			
S52.1	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ	Retain the Mixed Use zoning of 11-15 Jepsen Grove.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the IPI zoning for this site.	No
S52.2	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ	Retain the MUZ – Mixed Use Zone provisions as notified.	Reject	A number of amendments to the MUZ provisions are recommended in response to matters raised in submissions.	No
S58.274	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ	Amend the spatial extent and Application of the MUZ on the planning maps as shown in Appendix 4 of the submission. See the submission for details.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3	Accept	Submission point S58.274 is recommended for rejection.	No
S58.276	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ	Retain MUZ - Introduction as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the MUZ introduction text are recommended.	No
S58.289	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ Rule table	Retain MUZ - rule table as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the MUZ rule table are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.92	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ - Introduction	Seek that the Mixed Use Zone introduction is amended to remove the limitation of the provision of residential activities to above commercial activities, and to include retirement villages in the list of activities that are enabled in the Mixed Use Zone. Seek a definition of definition of a 'well-functioning urban environment' as provided under the NPS-UD to covers these matters.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S64.99	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ	Amend the activity status of retirement villages activities to be a permitted activity in the Mixed Use Zone and subsequently delete the existing matters of discretion for retirement village activities.	Reject	Retirement villages are provided for within the MUZ via restricted discretionary rule MUZ-R17. Taking into account the potential scale and mix of uses associated with retirement villages, the rule is considered to appropriately provide for the case-by-case consideration of proposed retirement villages in the MUZ. In addition, the matters of discretion under rule MUZ-R17 are considered appropriate for the consideration of resource consent applications under the rule.	No
OPPOSED* BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi * Note – the further submission states Oppose and seek amendment', however the further submission seeks submission point S64.99 be disallowed.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes retirement villages as a Permitted activity as they can have significant effect on the transport network, and therefore a full consideration of how such effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated is required through a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Accept	Submission point S64.99 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S72.15	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	MUZ-O1, MUZ-O3, MUZ-O4 and	Mixed Use Centre zone introduction, MUZ-O1, MUZ-O3, MUZ-O4 and MUZR3, MUZ-S2 and MUZ-S3 - Include provisions	Reject	It is unclear what specific amendments the submission is seeking are made. The proposed height of buildings within the	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Inc (late submission)	MUZR3, MUZ-S2	where Tangata Whenua values apply that these standards need to have more space and less or no additional height.		MUS as a permitted activity is 26 metres. This equates to approximately 7-8 stories. It is unclear how to justify a reduction in this height on a Tangata Whenua values basis. The submitter may wish to provide more information during the hearing to enable the requested relief to be considered in more detail.	
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission point S72.15 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes this submission point as the specific relief sought is unclear and potentially inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Accept	Submission point S72.15 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S28.8	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	MUZ-O1 and rules in CCZ, TCZ and MUZ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the following objectives and policies to enable Community Corrections Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed Use Zone Objective MUZ-O1.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Amend the rules in the following zones to enable Community Corrections Activity to be undertaken as permitted activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Centre Zone.</li> <li>Town Centre Zone.</li> <li>Mixed Use Zone.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Kāinga Ora support providing a permitted activity framework for non-custodial community corrections facilities to operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	Accept in part	Submission S28.8 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S33.19	Fuel Companies	MUZ-01	Retain MUZ-01 as notified.	Reject	Support for the objective is acknowledged, however an amendment is recommended in response to submission S62.16 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	No
S58.277	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-01	Retain MUZ-01 as notified.	Reject	Support for the objective is acknowledged, however an amendment is recommended in response to submission S62.16 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	No
S62.16	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ-01	Amend MUZ-01 by deleting reference to "surrounding". See the submission for specific requested amendment.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.93	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-01	Amend MUZ-01 so that "compatible" applies to light industrial activities only and not to residential activities.	Reject	The compatibility of activities within the MUZ may depend on the existing activities that are present when a new activity is proposed. This applies equally to light industrial activities and residential activities. Reverse sensitivity effects is a key issue in the consideration of the compatibility of activities.	No
S33.20	Fuel Companies	MUZ-02	Amend MUZ-02 as follows: Mixed Use Zones are vibrant, attractive and safe urban environments. The built environment is well designed, reflects the wide mix of <u>compatible residential and non-residential</u> activities and is generally of a medium to high scale and density.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S52.3	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ-02	Retain Objective MUZ-02 as notified	Accept in part	Objective MUZ-02 is recommended for retention, however amendments are recommended in response to other submission points.	N/A
S58.278	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-02	Retain MUZ-02 as notified.	Accept in part	Objective MUZ-02 is recommended for retention, however amendments are recommended in response to other submission points.	N/A
S64.94	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-02	Amend MUZ-02 as follows: Mixed Use Zones are <u>well-functioning vibrant</u> , attractive and safe urban environments. The built environment is well-designed, reflects the wide mix of activities and is generally of a medium to high scale and density.	Reject	<p>It is not necessary to amend MUZ-02 to include 'well-functioning', as NPS-UD Policy 1 already requires that planning decisions contribute to well-functioning urban environments. It is noted that simply inserting 'well-functioning' into the objective would lack context as it is not clearly linked with NPS-UD Policy 1.</p> <p>It is considered the requested deletion of reference to 'vibrant' is not necessary. Although this term is not used in any higher-level statutory planning document with respect to mixed use zones, it is not considered to be contrary to any higher-level direction. As an objective, it is considered appropriate as it reflects the diverse activities enabled and provided for within the Mixed Use Zone.</p>	No
S33.21	Fuel Companies	MUZ-03	<p>Amend MUZ-03 heading, and text as follows:</p> <p>Managing Effects <u>on Residential Amenity</u> and at the Zone Interface Use and development within the Mixed Use Zone are of an appropriate scale and manages potential adverse effects on:</p>	Reject	It is noted the zone interface may also include non-residential activities – such as those carried out within Open Space and Recreation Zones – such as those that may be carried out within the Open Space Zone adjacent to the Mixed Use Zone in the Maidstone Terrace area. Therefore, it is not appropriate to amend MUZ-03 to shift its	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			a) the amenity values of adjoining sites in Residential or Open Space and Recreation Zones. b) <u>the amenity values of residential activities within the same Zone.</u> c) <u>reverse sensitivity.</u>		focus solely to effects on residential amenity.  With respect to the requested amendments to add 'the amenity values of residential activities within the same zone', and 'reverse sensitivity' as subclauses within MUZ-O3, it is considered this is already appropriately addressed by Policies MUZ-P1 and MUZ-P2.	
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought in relation to reverse sensitivity, noting that residential intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management.	Accept	Submission point S33.21 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.279	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-O3	Retain MUZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-O3.	No
S52.4	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ-P1	Retain Policy MUZ-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P1.	No
S58.281	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P1	Retain MUZ-P1 - Appropriate Activities as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P1.	No
S62.17	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ-P1	Amend MUZ-P1 by deleting reference to "surrounding from clause 2 of the submission". See the submission for specific requested amendment.	Reject	It is considered likely the residential catchments that are serviced by non-residential activities within the MUZ will be from the area surrounding the MUZ – noting the spatial extent of 'surrounding' is not specified.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S33.22	Fuel Companies	MUZ-P2	Retain Policy MUZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P2.	No
S58.282	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P2	Retain MUZ-P2 - Residential Activities as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P2.	No
S62.18	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ-P2	Retain MUZ-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P2.	No
S64.95	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-P2	Amend MUZ-P2 as follows: Provide for residential activity where any residential units <u>or retirement units</u> are designed to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Achieve adequate indoor noise and ventilation levels for occupants;</li> <li>2. Provide a high level of amenity for occupants; and</li> <li>3. 3. Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on non-residential activities.</li> </ol>	Reject	It is noted retirement villages require restricted discretionary resource consent within the Mixed Use Zone under rule MUZ-R17. It is also noted retirements villages are defined as mix of activities, and these activities include residential units. On this basis the requested addition of 'or retirement units' to MUZ-P2 is recommended for rejection on the basis MUZ-P2 will be a consideration under rule MUZ-R17 for proposed residential units within proposed retirement villages.	No
S56.47	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-P3	MUZ-P3 Other Activities - Amend as follows: <u>6. There is a functional and operational need to locate in the Mixed Use Zone.</u>	Reject	The list of criteria contained within the policy is a holistic list – meaning all proposed 'other activities' will be considered against all subclauses in the policy. The proposed inclusion of a clause to refer to a <i>functional and operation need</i> for an activity to be located in the Mixed Use Zone will have the unintended consequence of raising likelihood of other activities being deemed to be inconsistent with the policy on account of a lack of a demonstrated operational or functional need to be located within the MUZ.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					Consequently, it is recommended this submission point be rejected.	
S58.283	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P3	Retain MUZ-P3 - Other Activities as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P3.	No
S58.284	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P4	Retain MUZ-P4 - Inappropriate Activities as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to MUZ-P4.	No
S64.96	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-P4	Amend MUZ-P4 to clarify that activities covered by LCZ-P2 are compatible.	Reject	<p>The determination of activities that may be incompatible with the MUZ requires a consideration of a proposed activity against the MUZ objectives, policies, rules and standards, and an assessment of actual and potential effects on the environment.</p> <p>Clearly activities that are listed as permitted activities, and where these activities comply with all relevant permitted standards would not be deemed inappropriate. All other activities require a case-by-case consideration via the resource consent process to determine their appropriateness on a specific site within the MUZ.</p>	No
S43.12	KiwiRail	MUZ-P5	Retain MUZ-P5 as notified.	Accept in part	MUZ-P5 is recommended to be retained, however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S58.285	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P5	Amend MUZ-P5 to insert reference to planned 'urban' built form. See submission for requested amendment.	Accept	<p>The requested amendment more accurately gives effect to Policy 6(a) of the NPS-UD. It is recommended to amend MUZ P5 as follows:</p> <p><i>Provide for built development that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Is consistent with the anticipated role, character, planned <u>urban</u> built</i></li> </ol>	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p><i>form and density of the Mixed Use Zone;</i></p> <p><b>Section 32AA evaluation:</b></p> <p>The recommended amendments to MUZ-P5 will better align with the direction of NPS-UD regarding the consideration of the planned urban built form. The amendments are more efficient and effective than the notified provisions in achieving the objectives of the IPI.</p> <p>The recommended amendments will not have any greater environmental, social, or cultural effects than the notified provisions. However, there will be benefits for plan implementation as a result of improved plan alignment with national direction, and the removal of potential conflict between the NPS-UD and these provisions.</p>	
S62.19	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ-P5	Retain MUZ-P5 as notified.	Accept in part	MUZ-P5 is recommended to be retained, however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S64.97	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-P5	Amend MUZ-P5 as follows:..... 3. <u>contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.</u> 3. <del>Is well designed;</del> and 4. <del>Contributes to an attractive and safe urban environment.</del>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.286	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P6	Retain MUZ-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-P6 are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.287	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P7	Retain MUZ-P7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-P7 are recommended.	No
S52.5	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ-R1	Retain Rule MUZ-R1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R1 are recommended.	No
S56.48	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-R1	Retain MUZ-R1 as notified (Note: the decision requested was summarised incorrectly but has been corrected in this table).	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R1 are recommended.	No
S58.290	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R1	Amend MUZ-R1 to add MUZ-S1 - Height to the preclusion from public notification clause, and add MUZ-S7 - Water Supply, Stormwater, and Wastewater, and MUZ-S8 - Hydraulic Neutrality to the preclusion from public or limited notification clause. See the submission for requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission, however the RVA seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Accept in part	Submission point S58.290 is recommended for rejection as partially requested by this further submission.	N/A
SUPPORTED AND OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:  Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent that it is consistent with Ryman's primary	Accept in part	Submission point S58.290 is recommended for rejection as partially requested by this further submission.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			submission, however Ryman seeks further amendments to a number of these standards to provide for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.			
S62.20	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ-R1	Retain MUZ-R1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R1 are recommended.	No
S64.98	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-R1	<p>Amend MUZ-R1 as follows: ...</p> <p><u>3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p>a) <u>Compliance is not achieved with one or more of the standards under MUZ-R1-1.a, and the activity is for the construction of buildings associated with a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p>(1) <u>The effects arising from exceeding any of the following standards: MUZ-S1, MUZ-S2, MUZ-S3 or MUZ-S5;</u></p> <p>(2) <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>(3) <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>(4) <u>When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p>	Reject	<p>Retirement villages are already provided for within the MUZ via restricted discretionary rule MUZ-R17. Taking into account the potential scale and mix of uses associated with retirement villages, the rule is considered to appropriately provide for retirement villages in the MUZ. In addition, the matters of discretion under rule MUZ-R17 are considered suitable for the consideration of resource consent applications under the rule.</p> <p>It is not necessary to include specific provisions within rule MUZ-R1 for the consideration of resource consent applications for retirement villages.</p> <p>Retirement villages are often provided at large scale and can include a mixture of activities on the site such as recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (including hospital care), and other non-residential activities. It is for these reasons retirement villages are provided for within the Mixed Use Zone as a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MUZ-R17.</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>(b) <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>(5) <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S2 and MUZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>		The Council requires the discretion to consider the effects of proposed retirement villages on a case-by-case basis to ensure the effects on the environment that may result from proposed retirement villages are consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan.	
S58.291	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R2 Note: was incorrectly summarised as MUZ-R3.	Retain MUZ-R2 as notified.  Note: was incorrectly summarised as referring to MUZ-R3.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R2 are recommended.	No
S32.5	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-R3	Retain Rule MUZ-R3 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment to add an advice note to MUZ-R3 is recommended in response to submission S72.12 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	No
S33.5	Fuel Companies	MUZ-R3	Retain Rule MUZ-R3 as notified.	Accept in part	An amendment to add an advice note to MUZ-R3 is recommended in response to submission S72.12 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.292	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R3	Retain MUZ-R3 as notified	Accept in part	An amendment to add an advice note to MUZ-R3 is recommended in response to submission S72.12 - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira.	No
S58.293	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R4	Retain MUZ-R4 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S62.21	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ-R4	Retain MUZ-R4 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.294	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R5	Retain MUZ-R5 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.295	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R6	Retain MUZ-R6 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.296	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R7	Retain MUZ-R7 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.297	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R8	Retain MUZ-R8 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S51.10	Ministry of Education	MUZ-R9	Rule MUZ – R9 Retain as proposed.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.298	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R9	Retain MUZ-R9 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.299	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R10	Retain MUZ-R10 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.300	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R11	Retain MUZ-R11 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S52.6	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ-R12	Amend Rule MUZ-R12 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. <del>The gross floor area per tenancy does not exceed 250m<sup>2</sup>; and</del> b. Compliance is achieved with MUZ-S6 (Landscaping and Screening).	Reject	The office tenancy limit of 250m <sup>2</sup> is a trigger to enable the consideration of whether more substantive proposals for offices would undermine the role and function of the City Centre Zone (to give effect to RPS Policy 30), and whether the office activity is consistent with the planned built urban form of the MUZ.	No
S58.301	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R12	Retain MUZ-R12 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R12 are recommended.	N/A
S32.2	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-R14	Seek clarity on whether the PA in MUZ-R14 rule and associated compliance with the standards relates to new service station activities and alterations to existing activities (such as an upgrade to an existing service station in the Mixed Use Zone).	Reject	Permitted activity standards under rule MUZ-R14(1) apply to all new service stations and alterations to existing activities such as an upgrade to an existing service station. If the permitted activity standards under MUZ-R14(1) are not met, restricted discretionary consent is required under rule MUZ-R14(2).  If an exclusion was proposed for upgrades to existing service stations, this would need to be specified via an exclusion in the rule.	No
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  Waka Kotahi has concerns with Introducing a permitted activity status for existing service stations as there is a service station directly accessing the state highway within one of the Mixed Use Zones and therefore potential for	Reject	Submission point S32.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			effects on the safety and efficiency of the state highway. Accordingly, upgrades should be a Restricted Discretionary activity with matters of discretion relating to impacts on the safety, efficiency of the state highway and accessibility in general.			
S32.6	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-R14	Retain the permitted activity status of Drive through activities in rule MUZ-R14 subject to meeting two qualifying standards relating to GFA and Rule MUZ-S6.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R14 are recommended.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.	Reject	Submission point S32.6 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S32.7	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-R14(1)(a)	Amend Rule MUZ-R14(1)(a) to exclude parking and manoeuvring areas at service stations from the calculation of GFA. One way of achieving this outcome would be to make the following changes: Drive through Activity 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The gross floor area of the activity <del>including parking and manoeuvring areas</del> does not exceed 1,500m <sup>2</sup> . <u>For the purposes of this standard, except for service stations, gross floor area shall</u>	Reject	The effect of the submitter's requested amendment would be that virtually all service stations would be treated as permitted activities no matter what the scale of effects generated. This outcome would be contrary to objectives MUZ-O1 – Purpose of the Mixed Use Zone, and MUZ-O2 – Character and Amenity Values of the Mixed Use Zone. These objectives seek to accommodate a range of activities including compatible light industrial and residential activities, and create vibrant, attractive, and safe urban environments. A large service station has the potential to result in adverse	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>include parking and manoeuvring areas; and....</u>		effects, such as traffic effects, that may be contrary to these objectives.	
			OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.	Accept	Submission S32.7 - Z Energy Limited is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S32.8	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-R14(1)(b)	Retain MUZ-R14(1)(b).	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R14(1)(b) are recommended.	No
			OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.	Reject	Submission point S32.8 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S33.2	Fuel Companies	MUZ-R14	Seek clarity on whether the PA in MUZ-R14 rule and associated compliance with the standards relates to new service station activities and alterations to existing activities (such as an upgrade to an existing service station in the Mixed Use Zone).	Reject	Permitted activity standards under rule MUZ-R14(1) apply to all new service stations and alterations to existing activities such as an upgrade to an existing service station. If the permitted activity standards under MUZ-R14(1) are not met, restricted discretionary consent is required under rule MUZ-R14(2).	No
			OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have	Accept	Submission point S33.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.			
S33.6	Fuel Companies	MUZ-R14	Retain the permitted activity status of Drive through activities in rule MUZ-R14 subject to meeting two qualifying standards relating to GFA and Rule MUZ-S6.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R14 are recommended.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.	Reject	Submission point S33.6 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S58.302	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R14	Retain MUZ-R14 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R14 are recommended.	No
S58.303	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R15	Retain MUZ-R15 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S33.23	Fuel Companies	MUZ-R16	Retain Rule MUZ-R16 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R16 are recommended.	No
S58.304	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R16	Amend MUZ-R16 to: (a) Delete Standard 1.a. to remove the permitted activity limit of 6 residential units per site. (b) Delete Standard 2.a. and b. to remove the matters of discretion that relate to the residential use. (c) add 'or limited' notification to the notification preclusion clause.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			(d) Make consequential referencing amendments. See the submission for requested amendments.			
S58.305	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R17	Retain MUZ-R17 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-R17 are recommended.	No
S64.100	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-R17	The RVA seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages activities to be a permitted activity in the Mixed Use Zone and subsequently delete the existing matters of discretion for retirement village activities.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S52.7	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ-R18	Retain Rule MUZ-R18 as notified	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.306	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R18	Retain MUZ-R18 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S56.49	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-R19	MUZ-R19 Emergency Service Facility - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.307	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R19	Retain MUZ-R19 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.308	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R20	Retain MUZ-R20 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.309	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R21	Retain MUZ-R21 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.310	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R22	Retain MUZ-R22 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.311	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R23	Retain MUZ-R23 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.312	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R24	Retain MUZ-R24 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.313	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R25	Retain MUZ-R25 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S58.314	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-R26	Retain MUZ-R26 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the rule are recommended.	No
S52.8	Oyster Management Limited	MUZ-S1	Retain Standard MUZ-S1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the standard are recommended.	No
S58.315	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S1	Retain MUZ-S1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the standard are recommended.	No
S64.101	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-S1	Amend MUZ-S1 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	MUZ-S1 is the permitted height standard for all buildings. There is no identified resource management effects-based justification to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion for resource consent applications that do not comply with the standard.	No
S58.316	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S2	Retain MUZ-S2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-S2 are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S64.102	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-S2	Amend MUZ-S2 as follows: Where the side or rear boundary of a site adjoins a Residential Zone or <del>Open Space and Recreation Zone</del> the following Height in Relation to Boundary standard applies: ... Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	Height in relation to boundary encroachments along boundaries adjoining the Open Space and Recreation Zone has the potential to adversely affect existing and proposed activities and buildings within the Open Space and Recreation Zone. It is considered inappropriate to exclude this zone from MUZ-S2 without thorough scenario testing (which does not appear to be included in the submission).	No
S56.50	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-S3	MUZ-S3 Setback Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>  Add new matter of discretion: <u>5. The extent to which the non-compliance compromises the efficient movement of residents and emergency services and the provision for the health and safety of residents in meeting their day-to-day needs.</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.  With respect to the requested new matter of discretion to standard MUZ-S3, it is noted the standard specifies the boundary setback requirements for buildings where the site adjoins a High Density Residential Zone, General Residential Zone, or Open Space Zone. The matters of discretion under the applicable building rules (such as MUZ-R1.2) do not relate to health and safety matters such as emergency services access, as those are already managed under the requirements of the Building Code. The requested matter of discretion would have the effect of introducing a matter of discretion that is already effectively	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					managed via other methods – i.e. the building consent process. It is not recommended to introduce any regulatory overlap between the District Plan and the Building Code. Therefore, although the concerns of the submitter are acknowledged, it is recommended this request be rejected on the basis the District Plan is not the most appropriate method to address the matters raised by the submitter.	
S58.317	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S3	Retain MUZ-S3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-S4 are recommended.	No
S64.103	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-S3	Amend MUZ-S3 to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.	Reject	MUZ-S4 is the permitted standard for the setback for all buildings. There is no identified effects-based justification to exclude buildings within retirement villages from the matters of discretion for resource consent applications that do not comply with the standard.	No
S33.24	Fuel Companies	MUZ-S4	Retain Rule MUZ-S4 and associated matters of discretion as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the standard are recommended.	No
S58.318	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S4	Retain MUZ-S4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the standard are recommended.	No
S56.51	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-S5	MUZ-S5 Outdoor Living Space Add advice note: <u>Advice note:</u> <u>Site layout requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the</u>	Reject	It is considered the requested advice note raises a matter that is already addressed under the Building Code. It is considered building designers should be aware of firefighting access requirements under the Building Code, and that non-regulatory methods would be a more appropriate method to raise awareness of the Building	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u>		Code requirements. On this basis the request to include an advice note is recommended for rejection.	
S58.319	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S5	Delete MUZ-S5 and replace it with the submitters requested outdoor living space standards, which generally provides for smaller outdoor living areas. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S64.104	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	MUZ-S5	Amend MUZ-S5 as follows: .....4. For retirement units, <u>clauses 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</u>  (a) <u>the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u>  (b) <u>a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>  (c) <u>Amend standard to exclude retirement villages from the matters of discretion.</u>	Reject	MUZ-S5 is recommended for replacement in response to submission S58.319. It is considered that any departures from the recommended outdoor living space should be considered on a case-by-case basis by assessing proposals against the matters of discretion under MUZ-S5.  It is considered appropriate that retirement villages within the MUZ – including any proposes outdoor living space, are considered holistically as a restricted discretionary activity under Rule MUZ-R17.	No
S32.9	Z Energy Limited	MUZ-S6	Amend Standard MUZ-S6 as follows (or other wording that will address concerns: 1. .... provision of an entry point to the	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>site, be <del>adequately</del> screened by a fence or landscaping where they are visible from any:</p> <p>a. Public road;</p> <p>b. Other public space; or</p> <p>c. <u>The ground level of any directly adjoining site zoned Residential or Open Space and Recreation.</u></p> <p>Amend clause 2, as follows:</p> <p>2. .... a. Be fully screened, by either <u>a 1.8m high fence fencing or the equivalent in landscaping or a combination of both</u>, from any directly .....</p> <p>b. ....to individual parking spaces for residential development, if provided <u>or where the site is utilised by an existing service station activity.</u></p> <p>Amend clause 3, such that it does not apply in addition to the landscaping required in clause 2.</p> <p>3. At least 5% of any ground level parking area not contained within a building <u>and not directly adjoining the boundaries where screening or landscaping is required by clause (2) above.</u></p>			
S58.320	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S6	Retain MUZ-S6 as notified.	Reject	Support for the standard is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to submission S32.9 - Z Energy Limited.	No
S56.52	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-S7	MUZ-S7 Water Supply, Stormwater, Wastewater Amend as follows: All activities shall comply with the water supply <u>(including firefighting water supply)</u> , stormwater and wastewater	Reject	As noted within the submission, the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works contains firefighting requirements. On this basis the requested	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			standards in the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works.		additional text within CCZ-S6 is not necessary.	
S58.321	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S7	Retain MUZ-S7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-S7 are recommended.	No
S56.46	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ – new objective and policy	<p>Add a new objective and policy as follows:</p> <p><u>MUZ-OX Three Waters Infrastructure</u>  <u>Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Integrated</u></li> <li>• <u>Effective</u></li> <li>• <u>Efficient</u></li> <li>• <u>Functional</u></li> <li>• <u>Safe</u></li> <li>• <u>Sustainable</u></li> <li>• <u>Resilient</u></li> </ul> <p><u>MUZ-PX Three Waters Servicing</u></p> <p>c) <u>All subdivision and development provide integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to their location and intended use.</u></p> <p>d) <u>Where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term, then avoid further intensification until constraints are resolved.</u></p>	Reject	<p>The requested new objective and policy is not necessary as three waters infrastructure provisions and requirements are already in place via subdivision and permitted activity building rules and standards within the zone chapters and the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport chapter.</p> <p>It is the role of financial contributions (or development contributions) and infrastructure management planning under the Local Government Act 2002 to address any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity and funding.</p> <p>It is noted the level of permitted activity development enabled by the IPI (as required by the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD) conflicts with the requested policy direction – particularly clause b). with respect to avoiding intensification.</p>	No
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:	Accept	Submission point S56.46 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			The RVA supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman supports the need for effective water connections to new developments, but opposes the relief sought in this submission on the basis that the need for adequate infrastructure to support development is already adequately addressed in these zones by other objectives in policies, particularly at the subdivision stage.	Accept	Submission point S56.46 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.61	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU	Amend all SUB-CMU Controlled and Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules to include a notification preclusion statement. See submission for requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS12 - KiwiRail		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for developments that do not comply with prescribed standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor	Accept	Submission point S58.61 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.			
S58.63	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU	Retain SUB-CMU rules as notified.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to some SUB-CMU rules in response to other submission points of submitter S58 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities.	
S58.64	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU-R1, SUB-CMU-R2, SUB-CMU-R3, SUB-CMU-R4, and SUB-CMU-R5	Remove landscaping from the matters of control or discretion from rules SUB-CMU-R1, SUB-CMU-R2, SUB-CMU-R3, SUB-CMU-R4, and SUB-CMU-R5.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.62	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU-P1	Retain SUB-CMU-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S56.17	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-CMU-R1	SUB-CMU-R1 Subdivision around any existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment – Amend as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a) Compliance is achieved with i. <u>SUB-CMU-S1</u> 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a) Compliance is not achieved with <u>SUB-CMU-S1</u> , SUB-CMU-S2....	Accept	See body of report.	Yes



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S27.20	Transpower New Zealand Limited	SUB-CMU-R5	Retain rule SUB-CMU-R5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the rule.	No
S58.65	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU-R6	Retain SUB-CMU-R6 rules as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the rule.	No
S58.66	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU-S1	Retain SUB-CMU-S1 rules as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the standard.	No
S58.67	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU-S2	Retain SUB-CMU-S2 rules as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the standard.	No
S58.68	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-CMU-S3	Retain SUB-CMU-S3 rules as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the standard.	No
S5.32	Bob Anker	SAZ-P6	Remove the paragraph from SAZ-P6 "it is council's view... anywhere in Upper Hutt City"	Accept	This paragraph relates to the gang fortification provisions which are proposed to be deleted in their entirety.	Yes
S.5.17	Bob Anker	Papakāinga chapter	Delete the reference to General Title Land owned by Māori.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S5.18	Bob Anker	PK-R2	PK-R2 remove the clause which precludes public notification.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S5.19	Bob Anker	PK-P1 - PK-P3	PK-P1 ensure that at minimum all adjoining property owners are notified and provide informed consent. Additionally, notification should be placed in the community newspaper and/or social media.	Reject	The identification of affected persons and notification decisions are made by the Council on a case-by-case basis under sections 95-95E of the RMA.	No
S8.1	Fiona Daniel	Papakāinga chapter	Adoption of a Papakāinga Provision within the District Plan.	Accept	The IPI includes a suite of proposed papakāinga provisions within a new PK-Papakāinga chapter.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S27.21	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Rules PK-R1, PK-R2 and PK-R3	Amend Rules PK-R1, PK-R2 and PK-R3 as follows: " 1. Activity Status: Permitted Where a. Any building must comply with the relevant zone standards for building height, height in relation to boundary, yard setbacks and building coverage where specified in the relevant zone chapter. <u>... x) Any building or structure must comply with the relevant zone standard and associated activity status that applies where development is in the vicinity of high voltage (110 kV or greater) electricity transmission lines.</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S41.31	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Papakāinga	Retain papakāinga provisions as notified, subject to submissions made by mana whenua.	Accept in part	The papakāinga provisions are recommended to be retained, however amendments are recommended in response to matters raised by other submitters.	No
S50.16	Waka Kotahi – New Zealand Transport Agency	PK-P4	Amend PK-P4 to include access as a consideration for the limitations of a site for papakāinga. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S56.18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PK-P4	PK-P4 Maximum scale of papakāinga development - Retain as notified.	Accept in part	It is recommended to retain PK-P4, however an amendment is recommended in response to submission point S50.16 – Waka Kotahi.	No
S58.79	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Papakāinga background text	Retain PK - Papakāinga - Background text as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the background text.	No
S58.80	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O1	Retain PK-O1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.81	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O2	Retain PK-O2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.82	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O3	Retain PK-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.83	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O4	Retain PK-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.84	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O5	Retain PK-O5 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.85	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O6	Retain PK-O6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.86	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-O7	Retain PK-O7 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the objective.	No
S58.87	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-P1	Retain PK-P1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.88	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-P2	Retain PK-P2 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.89	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-P3	Retain PK-P3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.90	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-P4	Amend PK-P4 to remove consideration of the effects on adjoining properties. See submission for requested amendments.	Reject	Policy PK-P4 will be a matter the Council has regard to under section 104(1)(b)(vi) of the RMA when considering an application for resource consent. An application for resource consent for papakāinga may	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					include proposals that breach the building height, setbacks, coverage, and height in relation to boundary standards of the relevant zone. It is considered breaching these standards may result in adverse effects on adjoining properties. Therefore, it is considered appropriate for the policy to retain reference to this potential outcome.	
S58.91	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-P5	Amend PK-P5 to include conservation activities in the list of non-residential activities.	Reject	It is considered conservation activities fall under cultural and educational activities which are already referred to in the policy.	No
S58.92	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-P6	Retain PK-P6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the policy.	No
S58.93	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-R1.1	Retain PK-R1.1 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the rule.	No
S58.94	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	PK-R1.2	Amend PK-R1.2 to be a restricted discretionary activity rather than a discretionary activity. Delete the proposed public notification preclusion specific to standard (b) and replace with a general public notification preclusion for the entire rule. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S72.26	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (late submission)	Papakāinga chapter	Papakāinga Whole Chapter - Retain proposed change.	Accept in part	The whole of the PK-Papakāinga chapter is recommended for retention. However, amendments are recommended in response to matters raised by other submitters.	No
S27.17	Transpower New Zealand Limited	District-wide matters table	Amend the District-wide table as follows: " <u>District-wide matters Subdivision within the General Residential Zone must comply will all</u>	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended that provide the improved clarity to the District-wide matters rule table as sought by the submitter – but these amendments are	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>relevant rules and standards: (a) that relate to qualifying matter areas; (b) that are in the district-wide matters and qualifying matter areas of the Plan as listed below: ...”</u>		made as a consequential amendment in response to submission S27.27 – Transpower New Zealand Limited. Submission S27.27 is addressed in the General Residential Zone section of this table.	
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: It not considered necessary to aid plan implementation and interpretation. Kāinga Ora notes that rules relevant to the National Grid are already present within the subdivision provisions of the operative DP (including SUB-RES-R7), which have been carried through unamended within the IPI.	Accept in part	Although it is agreed that rules relevant to the national grid are already present within the subdivision, earthworks, and building provisions, amendments are recommended as consequential amendments to submission S27.27 (within the GRZ section of this table) to improve clarity of the proposed approach to existing qualifying matters.	N/A
	SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  The areas surrounding NZDF Facilities (e.g. ‘reverse sensitivity buffer areas’) should be included as a qualifying matter and should be added to the table in order to manage the effects of reverse sensitivity from the proposed intensification.	Accept in part	Submission S27.17 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
S27.19	Transpower New Zealand Limited	District-wide matters table	Amend the District-wide table as follows: “District-wide matters Subdivision within the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone must comply with all relevant rules and standards: (a) that relate to qualifying matter areas; (b) <u>that are in the district-wide matters and qualifying matter areas of the Plan as listed below: ...</u>	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended in response to submission 27.14 - Transpower New Zealand Limited that address the concerns raised within submission S27.19.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S41.30	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Earthworks	<p>Amend existing provisions, or insert new provisions, to include:</p> <p>(a) Matters of control or discretion regarding the potential for adverse effects on water quality of any waterbody, wahi tapu, wahi taonga and habitat of any significant indigenous species and</p> <p>(b) Requirements for the provision of an erosion and sediment control plan with a consent application for earthworks.</p> <p>(c) Amend the standards for Earthworks permitted activities to include requirements for setbacks from waterbodies and erosion and sediment control measures to be effectively utilised to prevent sediment entering waterways and stormwater networks.</p>	Reject	<p>It is recommended to reject submission point S41.30 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) The request to include matters of control or discretion in the IPI are on the basis that this reflects Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions. As addressed in the section 32 evaluation, during the preparation of the IPI the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. It is noted there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA. It is noted Proposed RPS Change 1 is subject to many submissions, and its final form following the hearings and appeals processes are not yet known. It therefore recommended to reject this requested amendment.</p> <p>(b) The request for the provision of an erosion and sediment control plan with a consent application for earthworks is already a matter addressed in the following sections of the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works<sup>2</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part C – Design: A means of Compliance – Earthworks - C.1.2; and</li> <li>• Part D – D.1.10 – Stormwater Drainage.</li> </ul> <p>(c) The request to amend the earthworks permitted standards to include</p>	

<sup>2</sup> [code-of-practice-for-civil-engineering-works.pdf \(upperhuttcity.com\)](http://code-of-practice-for-civil-engineering-works.pdf)

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>requirements for setbacks from waterbodies and erosion and sediment control measures is a matter that is already managed by earthworks permitted standards EW-S5, EW-S6, restricted discretionary activity rule EW-R9, and the Council's Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works as discussed above.</p>	
S48.3	Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Not stated	Require a “no complaints” covenant, where the provision of noise and vibration provisions are not met adjacent to the railway, like is already on the property titles on existing housing located next to the railway’s boundary	Reject	<p>With regard to the requested provisions to include the registration of no-complaints covenants, this is not recommended as Section 17 of the RMA places a duty on all persons to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effect on the environment arising from an activity whether or not the activity is carried out in accordance with existing use rights under Section 10 of the RMA, a rule in a district plan, a resource consent, or a designation. Therefore, a 'no complaints' covenant as requested by this submission point would be ineffective, and potentially ultra vires section 17 of the RMA due to the District Plan attempting to limit a person's lawful rights under Section 17.</p> <p>It is also noted that if adverse effects (including noise) exists beyond the boundaries of the railway then it may be necessary for the infrastructure owner/operator to manage its activities by adopting the best practicable option to ensure the effects beyond the designation boundaries are reasonable.</p> <p>It is also considered that any existing restrictions on the titles of properties is not</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					a matter the IPI can reasonably investigate and form a view on. Notwithstanding this, if property titles already include restrictions it is not necessary or appropriate for the IPI to duplicate these in the District Plan.	
S37.1	Kimberley Vermaey	Hydraulic neutrality	b) rules be worded to only require hydraulic neutrality for buildings containing residential units that are connected into the council mains via either a lateral or kerb to channel connection. It should not apply to soak pit designs;	Reject	It is noted soak pit design and other methods that may be necessary to provide on-site attenuation must be sufficient to achieve hydraulic neutrality. It is not a guarantee that hydraulic neutrality will be achieved simply due to the use of a soak pit.	No
S58.38	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	SUB-GEN-R2A	Amend SUB-GEN-R2A to simplify reference to hydraulic neutrality. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept	<p>The requested amendment to SUB-GEN-R2A would simplify the rule by removing repetition of the hydraulic neutrality definition within the rule.</p> <p>It is recommended to amend rule SUB-GEN-R2A as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision and development must be designed to <b>achieve hydraulic neutrality</b>. <del>ensure that the stormwater runoff from all new impermeable surfaces will be disposed of or stored on-site and released at a rate that does not exceed the peak stormwater runoff when compared to the pre-development situation for the 10% and 1% rainfall Annual Exceedance Probability event.</del></p>	Yes
S58.100	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	GRZ-O4	Amend GRZ-O4 to refer to no 'net' increase in the peak demand on stormwater management systems. See submission for requested amendment.	Reject	It is not necessary to add reference to 'net', as this is already implicit via what hydraulic neutrality requires -i.e. to manage stormwater so it is released from a site at a rate that does not exceed the pre-development peak stormwater runoff.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.143	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	HRZ-O3	Retain HRZ-O3 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to HRZ-O3 are recommended.	No
S58.184	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-P8	Amend NCZ-P8 to add 'Require', delete 'will', and add 'to'. See the submission for the specific requested amendments.	Accept	The requested changes to NCZ-P8 are more appropriate wording for a policy, as they imply an action, which links with the relevant hydraulic neutrality rules and standards.  It is recommended to amend NCZ-P8 as follows:  <i><del>Require</del> <u>Require</u> <del>new buildings and development will to be designed to achieve</del> <b>hydraulic neutrality</b>.</i>	Yes
S58.219	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	NCZ-S10	Amend NCZ-S10 refer to the defined term and delete requirements specifying the performance requirements for hydraulic neutrality including the 10% and 1% Annual Exceedance Probability events. See the submission for requested relief.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.229	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-O4	Retain LCZ-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to LCZ-O4 are recommended.	No
S58.237	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-P8	Retain LCZ-P8 as notified.	Accept	An amendment to LCZ-P8 is recommended.	No
S58.273	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	LCZ-S10	Amend LCZ-S10 to insert 'hydraulic neutrality' and delete the hydraulic neutrality performance requirements as follows: New buildings and development must be designed to achieve <u>Hydraulic Neutrality</u> . <del>ensure that the stormwater</del>	Accept	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			runoff from all new impermeable surfaces will be disposed of or stored on site and released at a rate that does not exceed the peak stormwater runoff when compared to the pre-development situation for the 10% and 1% rainfall Annual Exceedance Probability event.			
S58.280	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-O4	Retain MUZ-O4 - Hydraulic neutrality as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-O4 are recommended.	No
S58.288	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-P8	Retain MUZ-P8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to MUZ-P8 are recommended.	No
S58.322	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ-S8	Retain MUZ-S8 as notified.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S58.329	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-O4	Retain TCZ-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to TCZ-O4 are recommended.	No
S58.337	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-P8	Retain TCZ-P8 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to TCZ-P8 are recommended.	No
S58.373	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	TCZ-S10	Amend TCZ-S10 to delete the performance measures for hydraulic neutrality and replace with a reference to the defined term 'hydraulic neutrality'.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.379	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-O4	Retain CCZ-O4 as notified.	Accept	No amendments to CCZ-O4 are recommended.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.409	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	CCZ-S9	Amend CCZ-S9 by deleting the performance criteria for hydraulic neutrality and replacing it with a reference to the defined term for hydraulic neutrality. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S64.17	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	GRZ-P11, HRZ-P8, NCZ-P8, LCZ-P8, MUZ-P8, TCZ-P8, CCZ-P8 - Policies	Amend GRZ-P11, HRZ-P8, NCZ-P8, LCZ-P8, MUZ-P8, TCZ-P8, and CCZ-P8 - Policies, as follows: New buildings and development are <u>encouraged to</u> <del>will be</del> designed to achieve hydraulic neutrality.	Reject	The requested amendments to the policies listed by the submitter would be ineffective at achieving the relevant objectives, and would be inconsistent with the permitted activity standards for hydraulic neutrality. It is noted the relevant permitted standards <i>require</i> rather than <i>encourage</i> hydraulic neutrality, and it is not recommended to change this approach in response to other submission points.	No
S64.18	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	NCZ-O4, LCZ-O4, MUZ-O4, TCZ-O4, CCZ-O4 - Objectives	Amend NCZ-O4, LCZ-O4, MUZ-O4, TCZ-O4, and CCZ-O4 so that hydraulic neutrality is not required (but encouraged) where there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system and / or the effects of increased water flows can be managed effectively.	Reject	Achieving hydraulic neutrality is an important component of addressing increased stormwater flooding effects that may result from the additional level of permitted activity development enabled by the IPI. This is recognised by Section 80E(2)(f) specifically identifying hydraulic neutrality as a related provision that may be included in the IPI.  The most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives is to require hydraulic neutrality for all new subdivision and development, and enable the case-by-case consideration of proposals where this is not possible or necessary via the resource consent process.	No
S64.42	Retirement Villages	GRZ-S9	Amend GRZ-S9 to address reasons (REGARDING HYDRAULIC NEUTRALITY)	Reject	The requested amendment would enable downstream systems that currently have sufficient capacity for stormwater to	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Association of New Zealand				<p>become overwhelmed before hydraulic neutrality becomes necessary. Such an approach would be likely to result in adverse stormwater issues in the future, and would pass on the costs of addressing this to people who did not contribute to the problem.</p> <p>It is noted the case-by-case consideration via the resource consent process is available for proposals that seek to not achieve hydraulic neutrality. This is considered to be the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives.</p>	
S64.50	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	HRZ-O3	Amend HRZ-O3 to address submission (REGARDING HYDRAULIC NEUTRALITY)	Reject	<p>The requested amendment would enable downstream systems that currently have sufficient capacity for stormwater to become overwhelmed before hydraulic neutrality becomes necessary. Such an approach would be likely to result in adverse stormwater issues in the future, and would pass on the costs of addressing this to people who did not contribute to the problem.</p> <p>It is noted the case-by-case consideration via the resource consent process is available for proposals that seek to not achieve hydraulic neutrality. This is considered to be the most appropriate method to achieve the relevant objectives.</p>	No
S72.3	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	HRZ-O3	HRZ-O3 Hydraulic Neutrality - Reword the objective to reflect that we expect high density developments do not just do the bare minimum (neutrality) but aspire to achieve best practice to ensure they create hydraulic positivity in the	Reject	There is currently insufficient justification for including the requested rewording to include hydraulic positivity. It is noted there is no higher-level statutory planning direction that the district plan must give	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			catchment and improve the quality of the environment.		<p>effect to that provides for the requested amendments.</p> <p>As discussed in the section 32 evaluation it is considered there is sufficient justification for the IPI hydraulic neutrality provisions, however it is considered going beyond hydraulic neutrality to ensure hydraulic <i>positivity</i> cannot be justified.</p> <p>It is noted the Council will be required to change the District Plan via a comprehensive future plan change process to give effect to any relevant provisions of Proposed RPS Change 1 once it is made operative in its final form following the hearings and appeals processes.</p> <p>No requirements in the NPS-FM have been identified that require the IPI to be amended to provide the requested relief.</p>	
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>Greater Wellington supports the introduction of hydraulic neutrality provisions in the IPI but consider there is a role for additional freshwater provisions to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>	Reject	Submission point S72.3 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is not linked to the effects of the particular development, and therefore should not</p>	Accept	Submission point S72.3 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			be the responsibility of the Development.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is not linked to the effects of the particular development, and therefore should not be the responsibility of the development.	Accept	Submission point S72.3 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S72.7	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	HRZ-P8	HRZ-P8 - Retain current wording and add 'hydraulic positivity' to wording.	Reject	It is recommended to retain the current wording of HRZ-P8, however it is not recommended to include reference to 'hydraulic positivity' for the reasons specified under submission point S72.3 above.	No
	SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  Greater Wellington supports the introduction of hydraulic neutrality provisions in the IPI but consider there is a role for additional freshwater provisions to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject	Submission point S72.7 is recommended to be accepted in part insofar as the existing wording of HRZ-P8 is recommended to be retained.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it goes beyond what is required by a development in managing its effects.	Accept in part	Submission point S72.7 is recommended to be accepted in part insofar as the existing wording of HRZ-P8 is recommended to be retained.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it goes beyond what	Accept in part	Submission point S72.7 is recommended to be accepted in part insofar as the existing wording of HRZ-P8 is recommended to be retained.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			is required by a development in managing its effects.			
S72.11	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc	NCZ-O4	NCZ-O4 Hydraulic neutrality - Recraft the objective to include hydraulic positivity.	Reject	<p>There is currently insufficient justification for including the requested rewording to include hydraulic positivity. It is noted there is no higher-level statutory planning direction that the district plan must give effect to that provides for the requested amendments.</p> <p>As discussed in the section 32 evaluation it is considered there is sufficient justification for the IPI hydraulic neutrality provisions, however it is considered going beyond hydraulic neutrality to ensure hydraulic positivity cannot be justified.</p> <p>It is noted the Council will be required to change the District Plan via a comprehensive future plan change process to give effect to any relevant provisions of Proposed RPS Change 1 once it is made operative in its final form following the hearings and appeals processes.</p> <p>No requirements in the NPS-FM have been identified that require the IPI to be amended to provide the requested amendment.</p>	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington supports the introduction of hydraulic neutrality provisions in the IPI but consider there is a role for additional freshwater provisions to give effect to the NPS-FM	Reject	Submission point S72.11 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.			
S5.7	Bob Anker	TP-S8	That this rule [TP-S8] be reviewed in its entirety to be certain that the wording clearly expresses the intent. Alternatively delete the rule.	Reject	The standard has been reviewed as requested. The IPI proposes to make only a consequential amendment to this existing standard to insert a reference to the High Density Residential Zone. No other amendments are proposed or considered necessary to clearly express the intent of the standard.	No
S33.26	Fuel Companies	Rule TP-R3	Retain Rule TP-R3 as notified.	Accept in part	No substantive amendments are recommended to TP-R3, however it is recommended to correct a minor typographical error.	No
S33.27	Fuel Companies	Standard TP-S1	Amend Standard TP-S1 as follows:  Where site access is required or provided the following standards apply:  1. All accessways and manoeuvring areas shall be formed and surfaced in accordance with the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works ( <u>Sections X and Y</u> ). Exemption – the requirement for accessways serving sites solely occupied by unstaffed utilities shall be that the accessway shall be surfaced with permanent all weather surfacing for a minimum length of 5m from the edge of the road carriageway seal.  2. Sites shall have practical vehicle access to car parking and loading spaces (where provided or	Reject	It is recommended to reject this submission point for the following reasons:  It is not necessary to specify the exact section of the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works as the location of the access requirements within the Code are indicated within the contents section. In addition, should the Council review the Code in the future, a Schedule 1 RMA plan change may be necessary to update the section reference.  The requested note below TP-S1(3) is not necessary or helpful for plan implementation. Existing use rights of existing lawfully established activities are provided for via section 10 of the RMA. It is noted the character, intensity, and scale of the effects of an activity must be the same or similar to those that existed before the rule became operative or the proposed plan	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>required), in accordance with the Code of Practice for Civil Engineering Works (<u>Sections X and Y</u>). This requirement does not apply to sites solely occupied by unstaffed utilities, provided that vehicles associated with utilities shall not obstruct the footpath or create a traffic hazard on the road. ....</p> <p>3. Vehicular access to a corner allotment shall be located no closer than 8m from the street corner. Where a site is located on an intersection of a primary or secondary arterial traffic route (as identified in the Transport and Parking (TP) Chapter) the siting of the vehicular access shall be located as far as practicable from the corner of the street. The 8 metre setback shall be measured from where the two front boundaries of the site (refer to the definition of a corner allotment) join, or in accordance with the diagram below. <u>Note: This standard only relates to new allotments, new activities, or, where associated with an existing lawfully established activities, where the activity will result in a material change to the number or change to the nature of vehicle trips to and from the site...</u></p>		<p>was notified. Notes in plans are not necessary to assist in the interpretation of section 10 of the RMA.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S43.19	KiwiRail	TP-S1(5), SUB-HRZ-S2(6), and SUB-CMU-S1(5)	Retain TP-S1(5), SUB-HRZ-S2(6), SUB-CMU-S1(5) as notified.	Accept in part	No amendments are recommended to these provisions.	No
S50.11	Waka Kotahi	TP-R3	Amend TP-R3 to broaden the rule to apply to all zones and all direct accesses to and from the state highway network.	Reject	<p>The residential zones under the IPI are subject to an existing specific standard requiring compliance with the access standard. The IPI does not propose to change this requirement.</p> <p>The proposed new commercial and mixed use zones do not duplicate TP-S1 within the provisions, therefore a specific reference to TP-S1 ensures subdivision, use and development within the commercial and mixed use zones are required to comply with TP-S1.</p> <p>On this basis, the requested amendment is not necessary.</p>	No
S56.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New standard requested	TP-R3 Site Access - Activities and buildings and structures if site access is compliant with TP-S1 and TP-SX.	Reject	This submission point is recommended for rejection on the basis the submitter's other requested amendments, including the new standards, are recommended for rejection under other submission points.	No
S56.4	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	New standard requested	<p>Include a new transport standard as follows, which should apply to all subdivision and land use activities in all zones:</p> <p><u>TP-SX – Firefighting appliance access 1. Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants,</u></p>	Reject	<p>The District Plan access standards do not require access to be provided to developments, but where access is proposed it must be provided in accordance with the access standard. Access requirements for firefighting appliances is not part of the existing access standards.</p> <p>The District Plan requires specific water supply standards to be met for firefighting purposes via the Council's Code of Practice</p>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <u>a gradient of no more than 16%; and</u></li> <li>b) <u>a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u></li> <li>c) <u>a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u></li> <li>d) <u>a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u></li> <li>e) <u>a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Zone: All</u></p>		<p>for Civil Engineering Works, while the Building Act/Code requires sets out specific building access and escape requirements for firefighting and evacuation purposes.</p> <p>The requested new standard would apply to all subdivision and land use activities within all zones. It is unclear whether applying such as standard to all zones – including those not affected by the IPI, fits within the limitations of the matters that can be included in an IPI under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.</p> <p>It is also unclear why the requested access standard would be required to be provided for <i>all</i> subdivision and land use activities.</p> <p>It is considered that for the zones where the MDRS has been incorporated, or where the requirements of NPS-UD Policy 3 have been given effect to, the requested new standard would be considered a new qualifying matter. To physically accommodate the access standard on a site it would likely require a reduction in the amount of permitted activity development on a site than otherwise could take place under the IPI.</p> <p>Although it is considered the submission point raises an important issue, it is not considered appropriate to include in the IPI as it is considered to be blunt method that may be inappropriate to apply across all zones for <i>all</i> subdivision and land use activities.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the proposed IPI.	Accept	Submission point S56.4 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
			OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited  SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the proposed IPI.	Accept	Submission point S56.4 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S50.12	Waka Kotahi	TP-S1	Amend the transport access standards for state highways to include minimum access spacing with any consequential amendments required throughout the rest of the plan to correctly reference the required access spacing standards for direct accesses to the state highway. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S41.29	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DC-P3	Amend policy DC-P3 to ensure the subdivider or developer is paying their fair share of new utility services and facilities as outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S50.3	Waka Kotahi	Financial Contributions	Consideration be given to initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports mode shift.	Reject	It is unclear what specific changes could be made to the IPI to provide the relief sought by the submitter. The submitter may wish to provide more information during the hearing.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.69	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Development Contributions	<p>Amend the DC- Development Contributions chapter to:</p> <p>(1) Rename the chapter to 'Financial Contributions'.</p> <p>(2) Delete all references to development contributions.</p> <p>(3) See submission for specific amendments to address the relief sought.</p> <p>(4) That the chapter be amended to include specific provisions that clarify how Financial Contributions will be applied including by:</p> <p>A. Provide a consistent methodology for determining FC across all forms of infrastructure, to the extent possible. For example:</p> <p>i. Assessing whether infrastructure upgrades are already allowed for within the Council's Development Contributions Policy and only charging FC on upgrades not allowed for.</p> <p>ii. Only charging the proportion of FC needed to service the proposed development (e.g., accounting for cumulative effects on infrastructure, but not disproportionately charging FC to those who may be the first to trigger an infrastructure upgrade).</p> <p>B. Provide specific calculations, to the extent possible.</p>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>C. Provide specific circumstances where FC will not be charged.</p> <p>D. Provide details as to who undertakes the assessment (e.g., per FC-S3.1.d) and the process for dispute resolution.</p> <p>E. By reference to an external document or resource, provide an 'online calculator' or similar tools to enable plan users to readily assess FC.</p>			
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART:</p> <p>The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.</p>	Reject	A number of amendments are recommended in response to submission S58.69 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities.	N/A
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART:</p> <p>Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.</p>	Reject	A number of amendments are recommended in response to submission S58.69 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities.	N/A
S50.15	Waka Kotahi	DC-P1 and DC-R2B	Amend DC-P1 and DC-R2B to refer to 'transportation' and 'facilities to access public transport and cycleways' as shown in the submission. See submission for detailed requested amendments. Any other consequential amendments are also sought.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S58.70	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Development Contributions	Delete DC - Development Contributions Background text to delete reference to development contributions. See submission for requested amendments.	Reject	The retention of the explanatory text provides useful context and information for plan users.	No
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART:</p>	Accept in part	Submission S58.70 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.			
	OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission S58.70 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.71	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P1	Amend DC-P1 to include references to 'those developing or subdividing', and 'based on the effects of the activity'. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
	OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.71 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
	OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.71 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S58.72	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P2	Amend DC-P2 to refer to 'those developing or subdividing', and 'to be responsible for the fair and reasonable cost', and to insert commentary that specifies that financial contributions are required 'where such costs are not otherwise addressed by any other funding source available to the Council. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.72 Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
			OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.72 Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S58.73	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P3	Delete DC-P3 and replace with a new policy as follows: ' <u>Require those developing or subdividing land to be responsible for the fair and reasonable cost of upgrading existing infrastructure or providing new infrastructure outside the land being subdivided, where existing infrastructure is not adequate to service the development, and where such costs are not otherwise addressed by any other funding source available to the Council.</u> '	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
			OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc. SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.73 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
			OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.73 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.74	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P4	Delete DC-P4.	Reject	The Council does not currently have a Development Contribution for Urban Allotments within its current DC policy. The IPI proposes to fill this gap in response to the significant amount of permitted development, and resulting potential adverse effects, that will be enabled by the IPI.	No
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission S58.74 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission S58.74 - Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.75	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P5	Delete DC-P5 and replace it with the following: ' <u>Require those developing or subdividing land to make a fair and reasonable contribution, in money or land, to open space and/or reserve contribution, where such costs are not otherwise addressed by any other funding source available to the Council.</u> '	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.75 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART:	Reject	Submission S58.75 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.			
S58.76	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P6	Delete DC-P6.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission S58.76 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	Submission S58.76 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S58.77	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	DC-P7	Amend DC-P7 consistent with the relief sought on the other FC chapter provisions. See submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.77 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART: Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	Submission S58.77 is recommended for partial acceptance.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.78	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Development Contributions	<p>Delete Rule R2-A to R2-E.</p> <p>(2). Notwithstanding the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission, deletion of a rule requiring an equivalent value equal to 4% of the value of each new residential unit or allotment up to a maximum of \$10,000 per residential unit or allotment is sought.</p> <p>(3). Seek a replacement rule for proposed rules R2-A to R2-E (see submission for the new rule requested by the submitter).</p>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART:</p> <p>The RVA opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.</p>	Reject	Submission S58.78 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION IN PART:</p> <p>Ryman opposes the relief sought to the extent it is inconsistent with the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.</p>	Reject	Submission S58.78 is recommended to be accepted in part.	N/A
S64.12	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Development Contributions	<p>Seek amendments to:</p> <p>(a) Ensure the dual financial and development contributions regimes will not result in double dipping;</p> <p>(b) Provide certainty as to the financial contributions that will be required to be paid;</p> <p>(c) Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works</p>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			undertaken as part of development; and  (d) Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.			
S27.3	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire IPI	Seek limited amendments to refine the IPI's approach to embedding qualifying matters.	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to provide the improved clarity sought by the submitter for qualifying matter areas under other submission points, however alternative amendments to those sought by the submitter are recommended.	No
S27.16	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Policy SUB-RES-P6	Amend policy SUB-RES-P6 to read: To provide for medium density housing within the General Residential Zone while: (a) encouraging the consideration of the protection and retention of indigenous biodiversity values within the Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct. <u>and</u> (b) <u>recognising that some parts of the Zone contain qualifying matters that may modify or limit the density or height of development. ...</u>	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as it not considered necessary to aid plan implementation and interpretation.	Accept	Submission S27.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S27.31	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire IPI	Seek that the provisions that manage effects on the National Grid that are proposed to reflect the National Grid as a qualifying matter are similarly extended to the new areas.	Reject	No 'new areas' referred to by the submitter are recommended via rezoning.  The provisions that manage effects on the National Grid are already contained in the District Plan. Relevant provisions are included in the subdivision chapters, the earthworks chapter, and rules that manage the location of buildings within the relevant zone chapters (residential zones, rural zones, open space zone, special activity zone. Whilst no amendments are recommended to these provisions, they are recommended to be included in the list of 'qualifying matter area' to ensure their continued application under the IPI.	No
S35.1	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	Qualifying Matters	It is sought that, as a mechanism, 'Qualifying Matters' be applied by Council in relation to the substation site identified in this submission to the extent that neighbouring (abutting) Medium and High Density Standard Zone properties cannot develop (as a permitted activity) multi-unit housing only 1.0m setback for the boundary and up to 20m in height.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management. Kāinga Ora does not	Accept	Submission point S35.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			consider that this constitutes a qualifying matter.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports this position in that higher density housing abutting qualifying matters can be provided for, but requests that reverse sensitivity effects are managed including through a 'reverse sensitivity buffer area'.	Reject	Submission point S35.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S35.2	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	Qualifying Matters	WELL seek that intensified urban development is appropriately regulated through the qualifying matters provisions in the legislation on land which abuts critical Regionally Significant Infrastructure and associated facilities such as the identified Substations.	Reject	See body of report.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management. Kāinga Ora does not consider that this constitutes a qualifying matter.	Accept	Submission point S35.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: It is appropriate that reverse sensitivity is recognised and provided for in the plan. Intensification of an activity or development will have impacts on land abutting Regionally Significant	Reject	Submission point S35.2 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Infrastructure and associated facilities such NZDF facilities.			
S35.3	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	Not stated	Seeks that all activities and development adjoining the Brown Owl and Trentham Substations must comply with the provisions of the underlying Residential Activity Area of the ODP as they currently stand (as are currently operative).	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, it does not consider that this constitutes a qualifying matter.	Accept	Agree that based on the information provided with the submission there is insufficient information to justify the submitter's requested new qualifying matter.	N/A
S35.4	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	GRZ and HRZ provisions; and Maps.	Seek that the sites identified in this submission are identified on the applicable district planning map overlays with appropriate annotations to the effect that either medium or high density housing developments on abutting sites will require a land use consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity thus enabling an effects assessment to be provided with appropriate reverse sensitivity mitigation being inherent to the development.	Reject	See body of report.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of	Accept	Submission S35.4 is recommended for rejection on the basis there is insufficient information to consider the creation of a new qualifying matter.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports the mechanism proposed in Wellington Electricity Lines Limited submission, and requests that NZDF facilities are annotated and housing developments on sites in the vicinity of regionally significant infrastructure (e.g. within the ‘reverse sensitivity buffer area’) are appropriately managed to mitigate the effects of reverse sensitivity.	Reject	Submission point S35.4 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S35.6	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	Entire IPI	WELL seek that Policy NU-P3 of the ODP is similarly reflected in the MDRS to ensure the adverse effects of the prosed housing intensification appropriately consider the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity on Regionally Significant Infrastructure such as the Brown Owl and Trentham Zone Substations.	Reject	Policy NU-P3 will continue to apply where resource consent is triggered due to proximity or potential effects on regionally significant infrastructure. It is not necessary to duplicate provisions from the NU-Network Utilities chapter into the zone chapters.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management.	Accept	Submission S35.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports this position as it allows Council to address the potential reverse	Reject	Submission S35.6 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			sensitivity effects of the proposed housing intensification on Regionally Significant Infrastructure such as NZDF facilities.			
S35.7	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	Entire IPI	WELL seeks to ensure protection of existing and lawfully established key substation sites which are located within the City's residential areas. The central point of protection stems from the actual and or potential effects of reverse sensitivity that will potentially be brought about through IPI implementation, and which will significantly increase the intensity of sensitive land use in close proximity to established substation facilities.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management.	Accept	Submission S35.7 is recommended for rejection on the basis there is insufficient information to consider the creation of a new qualifying matter.	N/A
S35.8	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	Entire IPI	WELL seeks that any intensification of properties surrounding the substations are provided for as restricted discretionary development so as to adequately integrate appropriate feedback from WELL (as an affected party) and the provision of mitigation against the potential adverse effects of reverse sensitivity (i.e., noise mitigation, screening, health and safety).	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, warrant additional controls or management.</p>	Accept	Submission S35.8 is recommended for rejection on the basis there is insufficient information to consider the creation of a new qualifying matter.	N/A
S41.7	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Ensure that density is appropriately managed within areas identified as experiencing 0.5 – 2 m inundation on the 'Regional Exposure Assessment 1% AEP' map.	Reject	See body of report.	No
			<p>OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities</p> <p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora support a risk-based approach to managing effects from natural hazards but opposes increasing the extent of flood hazard qualifying matter beyond those originally proposed in the IPI (3.1 (a) – (e)).</p>	Accept	Submission S41.7 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.8	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Ensure the District Plan provides for the management of development in areas at risk from natural hazards.	Reject	Addressing natural hazards is best achieved via a comprehensive non-IPI plan change process to enable the full preparation and testing of the evidence base, and to enable the full participation of the community, directly affected property owners, mana whenua, and all other interested stakeholders. Attempting to include new natural hazard provisions via a submission on the IPI does not provide for these processes.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S41.16	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Amend to apply setbacks to all waterbodies, and re-assess the areas identified for intensification as necessary.	Reject	Addressing natural hazards is best achieved via a comprehensive non-IPI plan change process to enable the full preparation and testing of the evidence base, and to enable the full participation of the community, directly affected property owners, mana whenua, and all other interested stakeholders. Attempting to include new natural hazard provisions via a submission on the IPI does not provide for these processes.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS3 Bob Anker			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>GWRC would appear to have learnt nothing from their very expensive encounter with the Environment Court in the case that they instituted against Adams &amp; Ors. Once again GWRC are using terms with inadequate or no definition which will again result in them forming rules by fiat. The test specified by UHCC does need some fine tuning to determine how an average width would be arrived at.</p> <p>GWRC need to define “waterbody” in such a way as to remove all doubt and subject their definition to public scrutiny.</p>	Accept	Submission point S41.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S41.32	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Not stated	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <p>(a) Include policies, rules and methods that protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant</p>	Reject	With regard to the existing RMA (section 6) and RPS requirements to identify and protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats, it is noted the District Plan does include policies and rules that protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna;	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>indigenous biodiversity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p> <p>(b) Include policy to direct the circumstances when and how biodiversity offsetting can be used, and if used, the outcome must be at least 10% biodiversity gain or benefits. Refer to an appendix for full details.</p> <p>(c) Include an appendix which sets out the limitations where biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate as described in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A of the Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>		<p>however, the District Plan does not currently identify and protect all such areas in the City. The Council is in the process of preparing a plan change to identify and protect the remaining significant natural areas in the City. This is a known gap in the District Plan; however, it is not considered appropriate to address this via the IPI as consultation with directly affected property owners is still underway, and a great deal of uncertainty remains over the potential final requirements of the NPS-IB – including whether it is to be gazetted at all.</p> <p>With respect to Proposed RPS Change 1, as required by Section 74(2)(a) the Council has had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 as discussed in the report and within this table. The Council notes there is no requirement to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement under section 75(3) the RMA.</p> <p>Proposed RPS Change 1, including the provisions the submitter requests the IPI gives effect to (updated Policy 24), are subject to many submissions including a submission in opposition from Upper Hutt City Council. A hearing is yet to be held, and it is unknown what the final form of Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions will be following the hearing and appeals processes. It is considered this uncertainty is why Section 75(3) of the RMA does not require the Council to change its district plan to give effect to a proposed change to a regional policy statement.</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					It is considered inappropriate for the Regional Council to be seeking the IPI gives effect to proposed RPS Change 1 provisions that the Upper Hutt City Council opposes and is yet to be heard on.	
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT: Kāinga Ora support having objectives, policies and rules pertaining to indigenous biodiversity, but the extent of these should be clearly defined in an overlay and these should be in an overlay contained in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.	Reject	Submission point S41.32 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S43.13	KiwiRail	Rules LCZ-S2, MUZ-S3 TCZ-S3 and CCZ-S2, NCZ-SSC-S1, GRZ-S3	Amend setbacks in LCZ-S2, MUZ-S3 TCZ-S3 and CCZ-S2, NCZ-SSC-S1, GRZ-S3, and any other zones affected by the IPI that adjoins the railway corridor to include a new permitted activity standard that requires a 5.0m building setback from boundaries adjoining the rail corridor, and a new matter of discretion that addresses the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The requested amendment to these rules would require the justification of a new qualifying matter under sections 77I, 77J, 77O, 77P, and 77R of the RMA. The submission does not include sufficient information to consider the application of the requested new qualifying matter.  The submitter may wish to provide additional information and justification for the requested provisions at the hearing.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought as far as it applies to the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back	Accept	Submission point S43.13 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.			
S43.15	KiwiRail	Noise	<p>(1) Add a new objective and policy to the Noise chapter as follows:  <u>NOISE-O2 Avoid where practicable, or otherwise remedy or mitigate, adverse effects of subdivision, use and development on regionally significant network utilities.</u></p> <p>(2) Add new policy as follows:  <u>NOISE-P3 Require activities to be appropriately located and/or designed to avoid where practicable or otherwise remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on regionally significant network utilities.</u></p> <p>In the alternative and to the extent the noise and vibration rules are included in each relevant zone, amend the existing objectives and policies (including NCZ-P2, LCZ-P2, MUZ-P2 and TCZ-P2) to recognize the need to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure.</p>	Reject	<p>Actual and potential effects on infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure are managed via existing provisions in the District-wide chapter – such as objective NU-O1 and policy NU-P3.</p> <p>It is noted there are a number of recommended amendments to add 'reverse sensitivity effects' to the matters of discretion to specific zone-based rules in response to matters raised by submitter S33 – Fuel Companies. These recommended amendments may partially address the concerns raised by submitter S43 – KiwiRail Holdings Ltd.</p>	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora oppose the use of the word 'avoid' in a noise policy limiting the development of residential activities near the railway. Onus should instead be placed on the source of the noise to</p>	Accept	Submission point S43.15 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			adopt the Best Practicable Option to minimise and mitigate at the source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:  Waka Kotahi support this amendment as it supports the outcomes sought by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development while giving appropriate consideration to the health and wellbeing of the future occupants.	Reject	Submission point S43.15 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:  NZDF supports the submission however, requests that instead of the proposed wording being related to significant network utilities, it relates to regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	Submission point S43.15 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S43.16	KiwiRail	Noise	Insert new Permitted Activity and Restricted Discretionary Rule into the Noise chapter to manage new buildings and alterations to existing buildings containing an activity sensitive to noise in all zones. See the submission for the requested new rules.	Reject	See body of report.	No
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option (“BPO”) to minimise and mitigate at source. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than	Accept	Submission point S43.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Waka Kotahi supports this approach and requests that it is expanded to also over the state highway network.	Reject	Submission point S43.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with the purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Accept	Submission point S43.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with the purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Accept	Submission point S43.16 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S43.17	KiwiRail	Noise	1. Add a new permitted activity rule into the Noise chapter, or alternatively into each relevant zone adjoining the railway corridor that:	Reject	See body of report.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Specifies the maximum railway noise level (measured in LAeq(1h)) that any new building or alteration to an existing building that contains an activity sensitive to noise must meet be designed to meet.</li> <li>(b) Requires that any new building or alteration to an existing building that contains an activity sensitive to noise is at least 50 metres from any railway network and is designed so that a noise barrier completely blocks line-of-sight from all parts of doors and windows to all points 3.8 metres above railway tracks.</li> <li>(c) specifies the assumed level of noise from the railway track depending on the distance between the railway track and the new or altered building.</li> <li>(d) Requires new internal ventilation that provides air flow of at least 6 air changes per hour, provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air, cooling, and heating of rooms between 18 degree C and 25 degrees C, and the noise emission limit for the heating/cooling or ventilation system can emit. See the submission for the wording of all requested standards.</li> </ul>			

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			2. Add new matters for consideration where the requested new standards are not met. See the submission for all requested matters for consideration.			
	OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option (“BPO”) to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.	Accept	Submission point S43.17 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	SUPPORTED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Waka Kotahi supports this approach and requests that it is expanded to also over the state highway network.	Reject	Submission point S43.17 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
	OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with the purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Accept	Submission point S43.17 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with the purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.</p>	Accept	Submission point S43.17 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S43.18	KiwiRail	Noise	<p>Add a new standard and matters for consideration into the Noise chapter or alternatively within each of the relevant zones adjoining the rail corridor as follows:</p> <p>New Noise standard:</p> <p><u>NOISE-S8 Indoor railway vibration</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a noise sensitive activity, within 60 metres of the boundary of any railway network, must be protected from vibration arising from the nearby rail corridor.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Compliance with standard (1) above shall be achieved by a report submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with the following matters:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <u>the new building or alteration or an existing building is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p><u>vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s vw,95 or</u></p> <p>(b) <u>the new building or alteration to an existing building is a single-storey framed residential building with:</u></p> <p>i. <u>a constant level floor slab on a full-surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations; and</u></p> <p>ii. <u>vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground; and</u></p> <p>iii. <u>no rigid connections between the building and the ground.</u></p> <p>Add new matters for consideration as follows:  <u>Matters for consideration</u>  <u>NOISE-MC4 Rail vibration</u></p> <p>(a) <u>the effects generated by the standard(s) not being met.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>location of the building.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>the effects of any non-compliance with the activity specific standards.</u></p> <p>(d) <u>special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate vibration impacts.</u></p> <p>(e) <u>the outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u></p>			

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option (“BPO”) to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.	Accept	Submission point S43.18 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS14 – Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: The RVA acknowledges that a vibration standard may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to high noise areas with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.	Accept	Submission point S43.18 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
OPPOSED BY: FS15 – Ryman Healthcare Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Ryman acknowledges that a vibration standard may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with the purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case	Accept	Submission point S43.18 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from high noise areas.			
S48.2	Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	High Density Residential Zone	Implement a setback based on district plan noise standards to be confirmed via a noise assessment from the Chalfont Road (Amberly Gardens), Kiln Street and Field Street boundaries of the Railway in which residential development becomes a restricted discretionary activity whereby discretion is restricted to managing the effects of reverse sensitivity; and/or add requirements for adjacent residential properties to be double-glazed and ventilated to protect the Railway from reverse sensitivity effects and complaints related to noise.	Reject	<p>There is insufficient information included within the submission to demonstrate that reverse sensitivity noise effects are a resource management issue for the railway in Upper Hutt City.</p> <p>It is also noted the requested new qualifying matter would have a direct impact on many property owners, and that these property owners have not been consulted with on the potential implications of the requested qualifying matter for the future use of their land.</p> <p>The submitter may wish to provide more information at the hearing - including Upper Hutt-specific technical information, to enable the consideration of the requested relief.</p>	No
S50.28	Waka Kotahi	Qualifying Matters	Include an overlay as qualifying matter which requires sensitive activities within 100m of State Highway 2 to provide mitigation for noise effects in accordance with Waka Kotahi standards.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora considers that effects should only be mitigated by noise sensitive activities in the receiving environment following adopting of the Best Practicable Option (“BPO”) to minimise and mitigate at source and in the vicinity of the corridor the off-site effects as far as possible. Restrictions on neighbouring	Accept	Submission point S58.28 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			noise sensitive activities should be no more stringent than necessary. Any such controls should be informed by evidential noise modelling.			
SUPPORTED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:</p> <p>NZDF supports Waka Kotahi’s submission in principle, in the use of qualifying matter overlays to provide mitigation for noise effects. Similarly, as per its original submission, NZDF requests that a ‘reverse sensitivity buffer area’ around NZDF facilities is included within the definition of qualifying matter area.</p>	Reject	Submission point S58.28 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S53.1	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	Seek to ensure that when significant intensification occurs within close proximity to Defence Facilities as proposed through the IPI, then reverse sensitivity effects are managed so that the ongoing operation of Defence Facilities are protected.	Reject	The submission lacks sufficient information and justification for the requested reverse sensitivity effects provisions sought for Defence Facilities.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora considers that reverse sensitivity effects should be mitigated at the source. Restrictions on nearby activities should be no more stringent than absolutely necessary.</p>	Accept	Submission point S53.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S53.5	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	Include the requirement for new development authorised by this Plan Change, that is within the NZDF reverse sensitivity buffer area, to include no-complaints covenants in favour of NZDF.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora considers that any reverse sensitivity effects should only be mitigated by nearby activities where any potential effects have first been mitigated at the source.	Accept	Submission point S53.5 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S53.6	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	The policy framework for both the High Density and General Residential zones acknowledges, and is supportive of, existing Defence facilities and operations, recognising that Trentham Military Camp has operated in this location for many years. The policy framework needs to set a clear direction in relation to avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on the Camp in order to ensure the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.	Reject	The submission lacks sufficient information and justification for the requested reverse sensitivity effects provisions sought for Defence Facilities.	No
S53.7	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	That additional permitted activity standards requiring the registration of no-complaints covenants in favour of the NZDF are incorporated into intensification rules, for new development authorised by this Plan Change, in a NZDF reverse sensitivity buffer area.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the imposition of no complaints covenants and considers that potential effects from the operation of the NZDF should be mitigated in the first instance.	Accept	Submission point S53.7 is recommended for rejection.	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S53.8	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	That reverse sensitivity be considered as a matter of control or discretion for proposed intensification not meeting permitted activity standards within a NZDF reverse sensitivity buffer area.	Accept in part	The potential for reverse sensitivity effects on Defence Facilities is acknowledge and addressed in some specific provisions.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the use of a buffer area as a way in which to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects of intensification near NZDF activities.	Accept	Submission point S53.8 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S53.10	New Zealand Defence Force	Definition – Qualifying Matter Area	Amend definition of "Qualifying Matter Area" to include "NZDF reverse sensitivity buffer area".	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the use of a buffer area as a way in which to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects of intensification near NZDF activities.	Accept	Submission point S53.10 is recommended for rejection on the basis of a lack of justification for the requested amendments.	N/A
S53.12	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	Include objectives and policies that specifically manage reverse sensitivity effects on Trentham Military Camp in both the General Residential zone and the High Density Residential Zone. Means to achieve this include through the registration of no-complaint covenants in NZDF's favour within the NZDF reverse sensitivity buffer area.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the use of a no complaints covenant and buffer area as a way in which to manage potential	Accept	It is recommended this further submission point be accepted.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			reverse sensitivity effects of intensification near NZDF activities.			
S53.14	New Zealand Defence Force	Entire IPI	Not specifically stated, support in part the proposed residential zoning on NZDF land and on the land surrounding Trentham Camp, subject to requested relief being granted.	Reject	The requested relief is not recommended for acceptance. The submission lacks sufficient information and justification for the requested reverse sensitivity effects provisions sought for Defence Facilities.	No
S65.2	Stephen Pattinson (late submission)	Entire IPI	Qualifying matters (Add UFD-O4): Introduce new Policy (LCZ-P8); Flood zone Pinehaven Catchment Overlay (SUB-RES-R9). Re-assess the flood zones in the Pinehaven Stream Catchment Overlay using accurate input parameters that are truly representative of the catchment in order to provide flood zones that are genuine 'qualifying matters'	Reject	See body of report.	No
S72.4	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (Late Submission)	HRZ-P1	HRZ-P1 - Identify sites and areas of significance and the boundaries of qualifying matter in this regard.	Accept in part	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington are concerned about the absence of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori in the IPI and wider District Plan, and consider that without identification they are at risk from the adverse effects of Development.	Accept in part	Submission point S72.4 is recommended to be accepted in part insofar as acknowledging and agreeing the submitter raises an important resource management issue that needs to be addressed within the District Plan. However, it is recommended this be achieved via a non-IPI future plan change.	N/A
S72.28	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (Late Submission)	General Residential Zone - Precinct 1	General Residential Zone - Precinct 1 – Indigenous Biodiversity Qualifying Matter Precinct - Objectives and policies in this chapter to use stronger wording	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>and language. For example, Objective GRZ-PREC1-O1 would be more effective if it were reworded to say: '<i>Indigenous biological diversity values within the Indigenous Biodiversity Qualifying Matter Precinct are maintained and protected.</i>' GRZPREC1-P1 could be reworded to say: '<i>Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are maintained and protected from the potential adverse effects of medium density residential development.</i>'</p> <p>Therefore, objectives and policies in the plan should protect indigenous biodiversity from subdivision and development.</p>			
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			Greater Wellington agrees that stronger provisions are required to protect indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. This would give effect to the operative RPS, particularly policies 24 and 47, and have regard to proposed amendments to Policy 24 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject	Submission point S72.28 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S72.30	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (Late Submission)	Entire IPI	The IPI Plan Change process will open the doors for developers, however in the absence of important overlays such as, SASMs and Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) that also have Tangata Whenua values, the Plan will be inadequate to provide necessary protection for these overlays. These overlays are qualifying matters. In the absence of such overlays, it is unclear how the Plan will deal with	Accept in part	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			an overlay that does not exist when the IPI provisions take effect.			
	SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council		SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington are concerned about the absence of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori in the IPI and wider District Plan, and consider that without identification they are at risk from the adverse effects of Development.	Accept in part	Submission point S72.30 is recommended to be accepted in part on the basis the concerns raised are acknowledged and accepted. However, no amendments to the IPI are recommended for the reasons provided under submission point S72.30.	N/A
S41.28	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Entire IPI	Retain the following provisions as notified: High Density Residential Zone background, HRZ-PREC2-P1, and Precinct description (Precinct 2 St Patrick's Estate Precinct, SUB-HRZ-P9.	Reject	Support for these provisions is acknowledged, however amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
S50.19	Waka Kotahi	St Patrick's Estate Precinct	Amend the St Patrick's Estate Precinct provisions to require the re-development of this site to be supported by a qualifying matter of a comprehensive structure plan process to support the development of the precinct that considers all aspects of the proposal, including transportation requirements, three waters, open space and commercial needs.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S56.31	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	HRZ-PREC2-R1, HRZ-PREC2-R2, HRZ-PREC2-R3	HRZ-PREC2-R1, HRZ-PREC2-R2, HRZ-PREC2-R3 - Retain as notified.	Accept in part	No amendments are recommended to these provisions.	No
S62.1	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Rezoning	Amend the zoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to Mixed Use Zone. The submission includes a considerable amount of reasoning and justification for all the requested amendments as a	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			suite. See the submission for full reasoning and justification for these requested amendments.			
PARTIALLY SUPPORTED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL SUPPORT:</p> <p>The original Waka Kotahi submission seeks that the St Patrick's Estate precinct is subject to the Development of a structure plan before onsite development begins.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi is supportive of this re-zoning if it is subject to the development of a structure plan that appropriately considers Infrastructure provision for the entire site, including provision for active transport modes.</p>	Accept in part	Submission point S62.1 is recommended for partial acceptance. Specific amendments are recommended for the Precinct to provide additional direction to decision makers on resource consent applications to address potential transport effects, including effects on the roading network.	N/A
S62.2	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Precincts	Move the proposed St Patrick's Estate Precinct provisions into the MUZ chapter.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S62.3	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Fix errors and consistency of language / Consequential amendments	<p>Amend via either of the following three options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Combine the St Patrick's College and St Patrick's Urban Precincts into a single St Patrick's Estate Precinct; or</li> </ol> <p>Note: the following two additional options were not included in the summary of submissions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Amend the District Plan text to refer to the St Patrick's College and St Patrick's Urban Precincts; or</li> <li>3. Add an additional layer onto the planning maps of the St Patrick's</li> </ol>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			Estate Precinct that encompasses both the St Patrick's College and St Patrick's Urban Precincts and make any consequential changes necessary within the District Plan Text.			
S62.4	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Precincts	Amend the St Patrick's Estate Precinct by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inserting the following text: The St Patrick's Estate is strategically located in proximity to State Highway 2, provides a regionally significant development opportunity, and is within ...;</li> <li>2. Delete reference to 'high density residential development' and replace it with 'a range of activities';</li> <li>3. Delete references to 'High Density Residential Zone' and replace with 'Mixed Use Zone';</li> <li>4. Make consequential amendments. See the submission for requested amendments.</li> </ol>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S62.5	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Precincts	Amend the St Patrick's Estate Precinct objective so it refers to the 'Mixed Use Zone', delete reference to 'High Density Residential Zone'.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S62.6	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Requested new objective - MUZ-PREC2-O2	Insert the following new objective into the St Patrick's Estate Precinct provisions: <u>MUZ-PREC2-O2 - St Patrick's Estate Precinct. The St Patrick's Estate Precinct is recognised as a development site of</u>	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<u>regional significance and a wide range of activities are enabled on the site through the Mixed Use Zone.</u>			
S62.7	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Precincts	Make consequential amendments to the St Patrick's Estate Precinct policy to reflect the requested rezoning to MUZ. See the submission for specific requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.8	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	HRZ-PREC2-R1	Make consequential amendments to HRZ-PREC2-R1 - resulting from the requested rezoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to MUZ. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.9	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	HRZ-PREC2-R2	Make consequential amendments to HRZ-PREC2-R2 - resulting from the requested rezoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to MUZ. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.10	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	HRZ-PREC2-R3	Make consequential amendments to HRZ-PREC2-R3 - resulting from the requested rezoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to MUZ. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.11	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	HRZ-PREC2-R5	Make consequential amendments to HRZ-PREC2-R5 - resulting from the requested rezoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to MUZ. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.12	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	HRZ-PREC2-R6	Make consequential amendments to HRZ-PREC2-R6 - resulting from the requested rezoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to MUZ. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S62.13	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	HRZ-PREC2-R7	Make consequential amendments to HRZ-PREC2-R7 - resulting from the requested rezoning of the St Patrick's Estate Precinct to MUZ. See the submission for requested amendments.	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.14	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ - Mixed Use Zone	Amend the MUZ Introduction text to remove the restriction of residential on ground floor. Alternatively, amend the introduction to the MUZ chapter to clarify that residential at ground floor is envisaged within the St Patrick's Estate Precinct.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S62.15	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ - Mixed Use Zone	Amend the introduction to the Mixed Use Zone by adding the following amended text from the HRZ chapter: <u>Within the <del>High Density Residential Zone</del> Mixed Use Zone, development within the St Patrick's Estate Precinct will maintain and enhance linkages to the Hutt River walkway and Silverstream Railway Station.</u>	Accept in part	The request to rezone the site to MUZ is recommended in response to other submissions by submitter S62 - Silverstream Land Holdings Limited.	Yes
S62.22	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	Requested new provisions – MUZ-PREC1-R1 – New rule	Include a new rule MUZ-PREC1-R1 to provide for garden centres as a permitted activity within the St Patrick's Estate.	Accept in part	Retail activities are recommended to be a restricted discretionary activity in the St Patrick's Precinct.	Yes
OPPOSED* BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi * Note – the further submission states 'Seek amendment', however the further submission seeks submission point S62.22 be disallowed.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes garden centres being provided for as a Permitted activity as they can have significant effect on the transport network, and therefore a full consideration of how	Accept in part	It is agreed garden centres are inappropriate as a permitted activity at this location due to traffic generation and transport effects. Retail activities are recommended to be a restricted	N/A



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			such effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated is required through a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status.		discretionary activity in the St Patrick's Precinct.	
S62.23	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ - New rule	Provide for supermarkets as a permitted activity within the St Patrick's Estate Precinct; OR clarify as part of the existing definition of 'large format retail' that it is inclusive of supermarkets.	Accept in part	Retail activities are recommended to be a restricted discretionary activity in the St Patrick's Precinct	Yes
OPPOSED* BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi * Note – the further submission states 'Seek amendment', however the further submission seeks submission point S62.23 be disallowed.			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Waka Kotahi opposes supermarkets being provided for as a Permitted activity as they can have significant effect on the transport network, and therefore a full consideration of how such effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated is required through a minimum of Restricted Discretionary activity status.	Accept in part	It is agreed it would be inappropriate to provide for supermarkets as a permitted activity within the site due to the potential traffic generation and transport effects. Retail activities are recommended to be a restricted discretionary activity in the St Patrick's Precinct	N/A
S62.24	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ - New rule	Amend the proposed St Patrick Estate Precinct provisions, as transferred to the MUZ, to provide for the educational activity functions of the St Patrick's College site as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S62.25	Silverstream Land Holdings Limited	MUZ - Mixed Use Zone	Amend the MUZ subdivision provisions by including, as necessary, subdivision provisions from the HRZ relevant to the St Patrick's Estate Precinct.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S27.28	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Rules GRZ-PREC1-R1, GRZ-PREC1-R3, GRZ-PREC1-R4	Retain Rule GRZ-PREC1-R1, Rule GRZ-PREC1-R3, Rule GRZ-PREC1-R4 and Rule GRZ-PREC1-R6 as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the provisions.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
		and GRZ- PREC1-R6				
S34.3	Mary Beth Taylor	Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct	Seek more Biodiversity Precincts including formalising and enhancing the Green Belt along the hills that frame the entire Upper Hutt River valley, east and west, north and south including the Silverstream Spur in its entirety as a road free reserve.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.6	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct	Replace all references to Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct with Indigenous Biodiversity Overlay with accompanying rules located in the ECO chapter as provided within Appendix 3 - See submission for more detail.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.137	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Indigenous Biodiversity Precinct	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the GRZ – Precinct 1 chapter and replace with an Indigenous Biodiversity Overlay, with a rule framework contained within the ECO chapter.</li> <li>Accept the changes sought in Appendix 3 of the submission. See submission for specific requested amendments.</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S72.29	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Inc (Late Submission)	General Residential Zone - Precinct 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General Residential Zone - Precinct 1 – Indigenous Biodiversity Qualifying Matter Precinct - Inclusion of mana whenua values for indigenous biodiversity and enable cultural activities.</li> </ol>	Reject	See body of report.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Greater Wellington strongly supports changes to the IPI to recognise mana whenua / tangata whenua values for	Reject	Submission point S72.29 is recommended for rejection.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			indigenous biodiversity and enable mana whenua / tangata whenua involvement in relevant decision making regarding indigenous biodiversity (e.g., the effects of urban intensification on indigenous biodiversity values). This relief would have regard to policies IE.1 and IE.2 of Proposed RPS Change 1.			
S34.2	Mary Beth Taylor	GRZ-PREC1-O1	Amend wording of GRZ-PREC-01 to delete the word 'encouraged' and include 'mandatory' or similar wording.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S46.1	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-P8	Amend the explanatory text of Policy DEV1-P8 as follows: <i>The Wallaceville Structure Plan identifies the Gateway Precinct as the location of a local centre incorporating retail, commercial and <del>above ground level</del> residential uses. It also establishes intention and outcome expectations based on an analysis of site values, constraints, and opportunities. Requiring development to be consistent with the Structure Plan will ensure that future development of the local centre represents sustainable management of the land resource.</i>	Reject	See body of report.	No
S46.2	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-R2	Delete Rule DEV1-R2 and instead rely on the permitted activities provided by the underlying LCZ; or Amend Rule DEV1-R2 as follows: Retail activity, restaurants, offices, early childhood centres, and residential accommodation <del>above ground level</del> on land identified in the Gateway Precinct of Wallaceville Structure Plan If Rule DEV1-R2 is	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			deleted, Rule DEV1-R6 will also need to be deleted.			
S46.3	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-S10	Amend Standard DEV1-S10 to correct reference to COMZ-S6 and retain the existing intent of the standard.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S46.4	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-S12	Amend Standard DEV1-S12 to correct reference to COMZ-S8 and retain the existing intent of the standard in providing an exemption.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S46.5	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-S13	Amend Standard DEV1-S13 to correct reference to COMZ-S9 and retain the existing intent of the standard in providing an exemption.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S46.6	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-R5	Amend the restriction on notification from DEV-R5 as follows: <i>In respect of this rule, and subject to sections 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c), 95A(4) and 95C of the Act, an application which meets the relevant standards and terms will be decided without the need for public notification under section 95A and any application that is consistent with the Wallaceville Structure Plan without the need for limited notification under Section 95B and for new buildings within the heritage covenant area limited notification will only be served on</i>	Accept	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<i>Heritage New Zealand (unless affected party approval is provided) under section 95B of the Act.</i>			
S46.7	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-R6	Amend Rule DEV1-R6 as follows: <i>Garden centres and all activities other than retail activity, restaurants, offices, early childhood centres, and residential accommodation above-ground level and not otherwise provided for as non-complying in COMZ-R20 and COMZ-R21 in the Gateway Precinct of the Wallaceville Structure Plan Development Area.</i> Correct references to COMZ-R20 and COMZR21.	Accept in part	See body of report.	No
S46.9	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	Gateway Precinct – Permitted activities	As an alternative to changing the zoning of the site as outlined (in submission point S46.8): Provide for the permitted activities of the Gateway Precinct within Lots 2,3 and 252 of the Urban Precinct as part of the Wallaceville Structure Plan Development Area chapter; or Provide for the permitted activities of the Gateway Precinct within Lots 2,3 and 252 of the Urban Precinct as a new Precinct within the LCZ chapter.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S46.10	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-S1	Amend Standard DEV1-S1 to correct reference to HRZ-S1.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S46.11	Blue Mountains Campus	DEV-S2	Amend Standard DEV1-S2 to correct reference to GRZ-S4, make any other necessary consequential changes.	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Development Limited Partnership					
S46.12	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV-S3	Amend Standard DEV1-S3 to correct reference to GRZ-S5 or delete the standard.	Accept	See body of report.	No
S46.13	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-S4	Amend Standard DEV1-S4 to correct reference to GRZ-S7 or delete the standard.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S46.14	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-S5	Amend Standard DEV1-S5 to correct reference to GRZ-S8 and retain the existing intent of the standard if necessary.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S46.15	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	DEV1-MC1	Amend DEV1-MC1 to correct references to provisions within the GRZ.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes
S5.1	(Bob) Robert Anker	Definition - High Density Residential Zone	Clarification of the mapped extent of the high density residential zone and text definition of the zone as to which shall have force.	Reject	It is unclear what conflict the submission point is seeking be addressed.  The IPI map accessed online (here: <a href="https://uhcc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=023844235de34d8da5a4be6328885983">https://uhcc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=023844235de34d8da5a4be6328885983</a> ) uses the term High Density	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>Residential Zone to identify all areas within walkable catchments of centres and rapid transit stops that are to be zoned High Density Residential Zone. The spatial extent of the High Density Residential Zone is shown in orange.</p> <p>The IPI definition for High Density Residential Zone states:</p> <p><b><i>High Density Residential Zone means the areas identified as High Density Residential Zone on the Planning Maps.</i></b></p> <p>The recommended IPI provisions include recommended Planning Maps identifying the recommended areas for rezoning.</p> <p>On this basis the mapped extent and the text definition align.</p>	
S5.2	(Bob) Robert Anker	Definition – Papakāinga	That the definition for Papakāinga be amended to conform with the body of the document text or that the document text be amended to conform with the definition.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S5.3	(Bob) Robert Anker	Definition – Qualifying Matter Area	That the document be changed to make it clearer as to the methodology to be employed to arrive at the average width of a waterbody (under clause (l) of the definition).	Reject	No amendments are proposed to the existing qualifying matter provisions under the IPI. The notification of the existing qualifying matters in the IPI is limited to their applicability rather than the content of those provisions. This approach gives effect to the requirements of Section 70Q(1)(e) of the RMA.	No
S5.4	(Bob) Robert Anker	Definition – Walkable Catchment	That the definition for the walkable catchments be amended to remove uncertainty.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S5.15	(Bob) Robert Anker	New Definition – Multi Modal Transport	Include a comprehensive definition of "multi modal transport" within the "Definitions" section of this document.	Reject	It is considered multi modal transport is a self-explanatory term meant to encompass all lawful methods of transport within the road corridor. Should a nationally or regionally-prescribed definition become available the Council could consider inserting a definition via a future plan change.	No
S27.5	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Definition – Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS)	Retain definition as of MDRS as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the definition.	No
S27.6	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Definition – Qualifying Matter	Retain definition of qualifying matter as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the definition.	No
S27.7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Definition – Qualifying Matter Area	Retain definition of qualifying matter area as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the definition.	No
S27.8	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Definition – Reverse Sensitivity	Retain definition of reverse sensitivity as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the definition.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports the definition of 'Reverse sensitivity'.	Accept	Submission S27.8 is recommended for acceptance.	N/A
S28.2	Ara Poutama Aotearoa – Department of Corrections	New Definition - Household	Add a new definition of "Household" as follows: <u>Household: means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not:</u>	Reject	Firstly, it is noted the use of an IPI for the insertion of provisions to support Department of Corrections activities in delivering its 'Ara Poutama' activities does not appear to fall within the scope of an IPI under sections 80E and 80G of the RMA.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>a. <u>any or all of them are members of the same family; or</u></p> <p>b. <u>one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.</u></p>		<p>Secondly, to provide the submitter with assistance on how Ara Poutama activities are managed under the District Plan, the following advice is provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The definition for <i>residential unit</i> does not limit the occupants of a residential unit to be exclusively the same family, nor does it restrict whether caregivers or support people are part of a household. The trigger within the definition for residential unit is that a self-contained space within a building, or a building is exclusively used by a person or group of people for residential purposes.</li> <li>2. Based on the description of 'Ara Poutama' activities provided by the submitter, the best fit in terms of a definition within the District Plan is a <i>community corrections activity</i> which means: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>'the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.'</i></p> </li> </ol> <p>This is a National Planning Standards definition that has been included in the</p>	

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<p>District Plan - however it has no associated district plan provisions.</p> <p>3. The next best fit for 'Ara Poutama' activities appears to be the District Plan definition for <i>community care housing</i>, which means:</p> <p><i>'special care housing used for the rehabilitation or care of any group of persons.'</i></p> <p>Community care housing is a permitted activity within the GRZ and HRZ.</p> <p>4. On this basis inserting a definition for 'household' is not necessary to enable the submitter to implement Ara Poutama residential activities within the GRZ and HRZ.</p>	
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks clarity as to how this definition relates to other defined activities within the District Plan e.g. rehabilitation facilities, boarding houses etc.</p>	Accept	<p>Submission S28.2 is recommended for rejection.</p> <p>See the explanation provided in the reasons for submission S28.2 for more information.</p>	N/A
S32.3	Z Energy Limited	Definition – Drive-through Activity	Retain the definition of drive through activity as notified insofar as it relates to customers generally being vehicle-centric (as opposed to pedestriancentric) and includes service stations.	Accept	It is agreed the term drive-through refers to vehicles rather than pedestrians.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.</p>	Reject	<p>It is considered the defined term for drive through activity is accurate with regard to the relevant plan provisions that refer to it.</p> <p>It is noted Proposed RPS Change 1 is still subject to the hearings and appeals processes, and some of the Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions referred to by the submitter are subject to a submission seeking amendments by Upper Hutt City Council.</p>	N/A
S32.4	Z Energy Limited	Definition – Service Station	Retain the definition of service station as notified but apply it only to those zones affected by the IPI; or retain the definition as notified but ensure that the status of a vehicle orientated facility where the principal activity is the refuelling of motorised vehicles and sale of products does not consequentially change throughout the plan.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S33.3	Fuel Companies	Definition – Drive-through Activity	Retain the definition as notified insofar as it relates to customers generally being vehicle-centric (as opposed to pedestrian-centric) and includes service stations.	Accept	It is agreed the term drive-through refers to vehicles rather than pedestrians.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Greater Wellington considers that reliance on private vehicle use should not be encouraged as it does not have regard to direction in Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3, and CC.9.</p>	Reject	<p>It is considered the defined term for drive through activity is accurate with regard to the relevant plan provisions that refer to it.</p> <p>It is noted Proposed RPS Change 1 is still subject to the hearings and appeals processes, and some of the Proposed RPS Change 1 provisions referred to by the submitter are subject to a submission seeking amendments by Upper Hutt City Council.</p>	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S33.4	Fuel Companies	Definition – Service Station	Retain the definition of “service station” as notified but apply it only to those zones affected by the IPI; or retain the definition as notified but ensure that the status of a vehicle orientated facility where the principal activity is the refuelling of motorised vehicles and sale of products does not consequentially change throughout the plan.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
S43.1	KiwiRail	Definition – Qualifying Matter Area	Add the following to the definition for 'qualifying matter area': '(s) areas adjacent to the railway corridor.'	Reject	This submission is recommended for rejection on the basis the submitter's requested additional qualifying matter under other submission points are also recommended for rejection.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought, and does not support a railway corridor being within the definition of 'qualifying matter area.' Kāinga Ora considers the 1.5m front yard and 1m side/rear yard setbacks, as required in the MDRS, are sufficient as these provides adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network.	Accept	Submission point S43.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports the inclusion of areas adjacent to existing infrastructure being included as qualifying matter areas to manage reverse sensitivity effects. NZDF requests that areas in the proposed reverse sensitivity buffer area are also included as a qualifying matter area.	Reject	Submission point S43.1 is recommended for rejection.	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S43.2	KiwiRail	Definition – Reverse Sensitivity	Retain the definition for 'reverse sensitivity' as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the definition are recommended.	No
SUPPORTED BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: NZDF supports the definition of 'reverse sensitivity' as notified.	Accept	Submission point S43.2 is recommended for approval.	
S43.3	KiwiRail	New Definition – Activities Sensitive to Noise	Add a new definition to Chapter 3.1 for 'activities sensitive to noise' as follows: 'Activities sensitive to noise means any residential unit, minor residential unit, family flat, rest home, retirement village, marae, community care housing, early childhood centre, educational facility, kōhanga reo, hospital, and healthcare facilities with an overnight stay facility.'	Reject	Neither the operative District Plan or the IPI use this term. All submission points by submitter S43 – KiwiRail that seek to introduce new qualifying matter provisions are recommended to be rejected under other submission points. There is therefore no need for a defined term for 'activities sensitive to noise'.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora oppose the proposed new definition as far as it relates to unnecessary restrictions in relation to noise and vibration.	Accept	Submission point S43.3 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
SUPPORTED BY: FS10 – Waka Kotahi			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT: Waka Kotahi supports the amendments sought because the expanded definition appropriately addresses all activities that could be affected by noise.	Reject	Submission point S43.3 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S51.1	Ministry of Education	New Definition – Additional Infrastructure	Add a new definition for <u>Additional Infrastructure</u> : a. <u>public open space</u> ;	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. <u>community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002;</u></li> <li>c. <u>land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities;</u></li> <li>d. <u>social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities;</u></li> <li>e. <u>a network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001);</u></li> <li>f. <u>a network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas.</u></li> </ul>			
S53.2	New Zealand Defence Force	New Definition – Nationally Significant Infrastructure	A new definition of “Nationally Significant Infrastructure” is added to Section 3.1 of the Proposed Plan, which specifically includes Defence Facilities.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
NOT SUPPORTED OR OPPOSED BY: FS-6 – Transpower New Zealand Limited			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR NEUTRAL POSITION:</p> <p>Transpower is neutral in respect of the necessity of including a definition of ‘nationally significant infrastructure’. Should the submission be allowed, Transpower considers that it is essential that the definition also include the National Grid on the basis that the NPSET confirms that the need to operate, maintain, develop and upgrade</p>	Reject	<p>Clause 8(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA requires a further submission to be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to a submission. Neutral further submissions are not provided for.</p> <p>Further, Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedures) Regulations 2003 requires a further submission to state whether they support or oppose an original submission.</p>	N/A

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			the National Grid is a matter of national significance.		On this basis, a neutral further submission is not valid.  In terms of the substance of the further submission, it is considered the recommended acceptance of submission S53.2 provides the outcome sought by the further submitter.	
S53.3	New Zealand Defence Force	Definition – Qualifying Matter Area	The definition of “Qualifying matter area” be amended to include a reverse sensitivity buffer area for Defence Facilities. This will include an area around Defence Facilities within which reverse sensitivity effects can be managed (through a qualifying matter) to ensure the safe and efficient operation of Nationally Significant Infrastructure.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED BY: FS8 – Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Kāinga Ora considers that no reverse sensitivity buffer area is necessary.	Accept	Submission point S53.3 is recommended for rejection.	N/A
S53.4	New Zealand Defence Force	Definition – Reverse Sensitivity	Retain the definition of Reverse Sensitivity as proposed. (NOTE - IS A DUPLICATE OF S53.11)	Accept	No amendments to the definition are recommended.	No
S53.9	New Zealand Defence Force	New Definitions – Nationally Significant Infrastructure	Add a definition of “Nationally Significant Infrastructure” and specifically include “Defence Facilities”.  (Note: this is a duplicate of S53.2)	Accept in part	Although the term Nationally Significant is defined in the NPS-UD, it is used in the same context in the IPI within Objective UFD-O4. It would therefore be appropriate to include a reference to the defined term to ensure the interpretation of the objective is clear.  It is noted defence facilities are not include in the NPS-UD definition for Nationally Significant Infrastructure. The Urban	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					Development Act 2020 definition is specific to the functions, powers, and duties of Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities. The District Plan has no provisions that manage nationally significant infrastructure as defined by the Urban Development Act. On this basis this aspect of the submission point is recommended for rejection.  See also S53.2 which requests the same amendments.	
NEUTRAL FURTHER SUBMISSION BY: FS-6 – Transpower New Zealand Limited			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR NEUTRAL POSITION:  Transpower is neutral in respect of the necessity of including a definition of 'nationally significant infrastructure'. Should the submission be allowed, Transpower considers that it is essential that the definition also include the National Grid on the basis that the NPS-ET confirms that the need to operate, maintain, develop and upgrade the National Grid is a matter of national significance.	Reject	Clause 8(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA requires a further submission to be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to a submission. Neutral further submissions are not provided for.  Further, Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedures) Regulations 2003 requires a further submission to state whether they support or oppose an original submission.  On this basis, a neutral further submission is not valid.  In terms of the substance of the further submission, it is considered the recommended acceptance of submission S53.2 provides the outcome sought by the further submitter.	N/A
S53.11	New Zealand Defence Force	Definition – Reverse Sensitivity	Retain definition of 'reverse sensitivity' as notified. (NOTE - IS A DUPLICATE OF S53.4)	Accept	No amendments to the definition are recommended.	No
S56.1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Definition – Emergency	Definition - Emergency service facility - Retain as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the definition are recommended.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
		Service Facility				
S58.11	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Ancestral Land	Retain definition for 'ancestral land' as notified.	Accept	No amendments to the definition are recommended.	No
S58.12	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Comprehensive Residential Development	Retain deletion of definition for 'comprehensive residential development' as notified.	Accept	The deletion of the definition is still recommended.	No
S58.13	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition - Dwelling	Delete definition for 'dwelling' and make consequential amendments to replace with the term 'residential unit'.	Reject	<p>It is agreed a more appropriate term would be 'residential unit'. However, the term 'dwelling' is used within mandatory MDRS provisions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRZ-P1A</li> <li>• GRZ-S14 – Outlook space (per residential unit)</li> </ul> <p>It is noted the Council does not have the discretion to change these provisions as they are mandated under section 77G(1) of the RMA.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended to retain the definition for 'dwelling' to ensure there are no interpretation issues during plan implementation and consideration of the relevant MDRS provisions incorporated into the District Plan.</p>	No
S58.14	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – High Density Residential Zone	Delete definition for 'high density residential zone'.	Accept	See body of report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.15	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Hydraulic Neutrality	Amend definition for hydraulic neutrality to delete reference to on-site disposal or storage, and references to the 10% and 1% AEP flood events. See submission for specific requested wording.	Reject	It would be inappropriate to remove the reference to the performance criteria of not exceeding the predevelopment peak stormwater runoff for the 10% and 1% rainfall Annual Exceedance Probability event. Without these performance criteria it would be very difficult to determine whether any proposed buildings or development complied with the relevant permitted activity standard for hydraulic neutrality. This is particularly the case following other recommendations in this table to accept other requested amendments by submitter S58 to remove the performance criteria from all relevant hydraulic neutrality standards and rely on the definition.	No
S58.16	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – General Residential Zone	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rename the 'General Residential Zone' as the 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</li> <li>2. All references of this residential zone to be amended throughout the IPI.</li> </ol>	Reject	The General Residential Zone is a 'relevant residential zone' under section 70G(1) of the RMA. Therefore, the MDRS must be incorporated into the GRZ provisions, however there is no requirement under the RMA or National Planning Standards for the Council to amend the name of the zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. It is noted the GRZ does not preclude more traditional lower density subdivision and development.	No
S58.17	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Papakāinga	Amend definition to refer to residential and conservation activities. Include reference to supporting cultural, environmental, and economic wellbeing. See submission for specific requested amendments.	Reject	The definition has been prepared in partnership with mana whenua, and on this basis, it is considered the definition appropriately provides for papakāinga activities in Upper Hutt.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
S58.18	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Relevant Residential Zone	Amend definition for 'relevant residential zone' to replace reference to 'general residential zone' with 'medium density residential zone'.	Reject	The General Residential Zone is a 'relevant residential zone' under section 70G(1) of the RMA. Therefore, the MDRS must be incorporated into the GRZ provisions, however there is no requirement under the RMA or National Planning Standards for the Council to amend the name of the zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. It is noted the GRZ does not preclude more traditional lower density subdivision and development.	No
S58.19	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Reverse Sensitivity	Retain definition for 'reverse sensitivity' as notified.	Accept	No amendments are recommended to the definition as notified.	No
S58.20	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Definition – Walkable Catchment	Delete definition for 'walkable catchment' and make necessary consequential amendments across the district plan.	Reject	The term is used in a number of different locations within the IPI. Amendments to the definition are recommended in response to submission S5.34 – Bob Anker.	No
S64.1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	New Definition – Retirement Unit	Add the following definition: 'retirement unit'. <b>Retirement Unit</b> means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.	Reject	The requested new definition conflicts with the definition for residential unit. If a retirement unit includes the components necessary to be deemed a residential unit, then retirement units are residential units.  It is also noted the requested amendment to exclude retirement units from the definition for residential unit would have unintended consequences across the District Plan for the applicability of district-wide rules that manage the location of residential units. As an example, the natural hazard provisions that would no longer apply to 'retirement units' include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural hazard provisions</li> <li>• Policy NH-P8</li> </ul>	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted activity rule NH-R4</li> <li>• Permitted activity standard NH-S3</li> <li>• Restricted discretionary activity standard NH-S9</li> <li>• Restricted discretionary activity rule NH-R10</li> <li>• Restricted discretionary activity rule NH-R11</li> <li>• Discretionary activity rule Rule NH-R15</li> <li>• Discretionary activity rule NH-R16</li> <li>• Non-complying activity rule NH-R20</li> </ul> <p>All other requested amendments to the IPI by submitter S64 to incorporate retirement village-specific provisions into the IPI are recommended for rejection. Consequently, the requested new definition serves no purpose.</p>	
S16.1	Peri Zee	Entire IPI	Additional land should be up zoned for retail/mixed use in the northern suburbs described above to provide necessary services (small supermarkets, pharmacy, GP, community centres etc) and to create identifiable centres within walking /biking distance to people's homes.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S29.1	Farrah Breads Family Trust	Maps	Rezoning of land at 57 Kiln Street to general residential.	Reject	See body of report.	no
OPPOSED BY: FS1 - Logan McLean (Entire submission by Farrah Breads Family Trust is opposed)			SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  The urban planning that has led to this industrial area being surrounded on all sides by residential areas has caused nothing but issues for UHCC and all	Accept	Existing reverse sensitivity issues have been mitigated but agree it is not appropriate to add further residential activities closer to the site. It is uncertain whether the mitigation put in place will eliminate reverse sensitivity effects.	no

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>property owners in the area. Farrah's are now requesting to further reduce what little offset there is between their noisy industrial operations and residential homes. Farrah's have had more complaints about their operations than any other business in the history of Upper Hutt. The impact of their operations on nearby residential homes continues to be significant and rezoning to allow residential areas even closer to this nuisance would guarantee further issues. The area requested to be rezoned is the closest possible point to the equipment that has been identified as causing the primary noise nuisance from their operations. UHCC has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars already trying to get this business to comply with the District Plan and make the area liveable for the existing residents. If this submission was supported it would exacerbate the existing issues and create additional ones along the same lines for many new families.</p>			
OPPOSED BY: FS2 - Rach Trudgeon	(Entire submission by Farrah Breads Family Trust is opposed)		<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>I oppose this submission due to the destruction and removal of our green areas, where there is currently native bush, mature trees, and bird life. This would greatly impact the views and natural surroundings that I have and would change greatly the environment that we live in. We are already greatly impacted by the noise that Farrahs</p>	Accept	Existing reverse sensitivity issues have been mitigated but agree it is not appropriate to add further residential activities closer to the site. It is uncertain whether the mitigation put in place will eliminate reverse sensitivity effects.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			<p>factory emits which has yet to be resolved by the council. There is also very limited, and already very busy roading in the area and putting in the development of this size will largely impact the access and roading in the region. It is so important that we have a mix of residential and green areas for the health of our region, and our people. This should not be approved, in any form.</p>			
	<p>OPPOSED BY: FS5 – Willis (Entire submission by Farrah Breads Family Trust is opposed)</p>		<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:</p> <p>The proposed site is an area of greenery including native bush, and an area where there is large population of birds. The proposal would provide for a large number of dwellings directly adjacent to the Farrahs Bread Factory which is already generating a large number of complaints from the community concerning the noise levels of ceiling fans and HVACs, an issue which has been ongoing for nearly three years. Residing in Kurth Crescent this would significantly reduce our views of hillside greenery. A further major concern is the amount of traffic that would be generated by the addition of so many further dwellings.</p> <p>The major housing construction along Alexander Road has already significantly impacted the amount of traffic passing through Silverstream especially at peak times for commuter traffic and the</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>Existing reverse sensitivity issues have been mitigated but agree it is not appropriate to add further residential activities closer to the site. It is uncertain whether the mitigation put in place will eliminate reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	<p>No</p>

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			roundabout by the Silverstream Fire Station would be a nightmare with the addition of yet further traffic should this proposal proceed. Is there a provision for further school/kindergarten/daycare facilities to accommodate an increased populations - potentially up to 60 buildings, if plan change goes ahead as intended			
S40.1	Dean Spicer	Maps	Rezone the property at 224a Parkes Lines Road and the surrounding block of land at 168/180/180A/186/216/224A/224B/264 G Parkes Line Road, Maymorn to a density at least congruent to Large Lot Residential Zone under the National Planning Standards.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S46.8	Blue Mountains Campus Development Limited Partnership	High Density Residential Zone / Local Centre Zone	Change the zoning of Lots 2, 3 and 252 of the Urban Precinct from High Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S48.1	Silver Stream Railway Incorporated	Maps	Change the zoning surrounding the Railway's Chalfont Road (Amberly Gardens), Kiln Street and Field Street boundaries from 'High Density Residential' to the zoning under the operative district plan or another zoning that is less enabling of housing such as 'General Residential'.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S49.1	Logan McLean	Maps	Re-zone the Farrah's site to residential. Alternatively, do not support the surrounding impacted area to be re-zoned to high density until such time as	Reject	See body of report.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			all issues associated with this industrial zone have been resolved and UHCC is capable of enforcing the relevant provisions in the District Plan to protect the amenity value of the surrounding residential areas. Ensure that provisions in the District Plan are not relaxed around this area in regard to noise etc that impact on the amenity values of the neighbourhood.			
S58.275	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	MUZ	Rezone Blue Mountain Campus to Mixed Use Zone, as shown in Appendix 4 of the submission. See the submission for details.	Reject	See body of report.	No
S58.324	Kāinga Ora: Homes and Communities	Trentham LCZ	Amend Trentham LCZ to become TCZ, as shown in Appendix 4 of the submission. If the relief sought is not granted, the following relief is sought:  (a) Trentham as a TCZ – no variation to outcomes sought consistent with rest of submission.  (b) b. Spatial Extent of Trentham TCZ – height variation of 29m to HRZ. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the changes sought in this submission. See the submission and its Appendix 4 for details.	Reject	See body of report.	No
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS4 – Greater Wellington Regional Council			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION: Greater Wellington supports intensification; however we do not support intensification beyond the NPS-	Accept in part	Agree regarding not exceeding the NPS requirements, but do not agree with respect to implementing RPS change 1.	No



Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
			UD unless the District Plan contains necessary controls to manage potential adverse effects on water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Objective 12 and Policy FW.3			
S69.1	RACE Inc (Racing at Awapuni and Trentham Combined Enterprises Incorporated) (late submission)	Maps	Seek that:  1) the part of the Trentham Racecourse shown hatched on the attached aerial at Pt Lot 2 527769 and Lot 4 522882 be rezoned, and  2) that the Mixed Use Zone provisions apply.	Accept in part	See body of report.	Yes
OPPOSED BY: FS7 – Summerset Group Holdings			SUMMARISED REASONS FOR OPPOSITION:  Summerset opposes the rezoning sought by Race Inc in the absence of any amenity protections being included in the plan provisions in relation to the Summerset site. Rezoning of the Race Inc site as sought would allow for a range of activities and built development on the site in a manner that has the potential to adversely affect the amenity of residents within the Summerset site. There are no protections under the zoning proposed by Race Inc that would apply to the Special Activity zone which applies to the Summerset site. See the further submission for potential methods to address these concerns.	Accept in part	Rezone but add Mixed use zone provisions for this site provisions to ensure amenity values of Summerset Village are retained – ensure MUZ-S2 – Height in Relation to Boundary, and MUZ-S3 - Setbacks are applied along the shared boundary.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
SUPPORTED BY: FS9 – Gilles Group Management Trust			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR SUPPORT:</p> <p>The said portion of the Trentham Racecourse is an appropriate location for mixed use development and intensification as the site immediately adjoins the Trentham Train Station and an existing rapid transit corridor.</p> <p>The Trentham Racecourse is zoned Special Activity, where permitted activities are limited and restrictive as they do not provide for mixed use development and residential intensification which could co-exist and complement the racecourse/horse racing on the site. (See the further submission for additional reasons for support).</p>	Accept in part	<p>This part of the Trentham Racecourse has been identified for a future mixed use development including housing, retail and services while retaining the racecourse functions. Funding has been made available via the infrastructure investment fund to facilitate this development.</p> <p>Accept with the addition of reverse sensitivity provisions to address potential adverse effects on Summerset Village.</p>	Yes
OPPOSED IN PART BY: FS13 – New Zealand Defence Force			<p>SUMMARISED REASONS FOR PARTIAL OPPOSITION:</p> <p>Development of the land as anticipated by a Mixed Use zoning, inside the hatched area illustrated in RACE's submission, could potentially give rise to reverse sensitivity effects due to the proximity of the area to Trentham Military Camp. NZDF opposes this submission in part subject to the development of adequate controls to manage reverse sensitivity effects on Trentham Military Camp.</p>	Reject	<p>The MUZ noise and ventilation provisions are considered adequate to manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on the Trentham Military Base.</p> <p>The further submitter may wish to provide additional information at the hearing to enable the consideration of any specific requested additional provisions to address reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	No
S71.1	The Heretaunga Co Limited and The	Maps	The New Zealand Campus of Innovation and Sport and Sports Hub be rezoned Mixed Use Zone in the IPI Plan Change.	Reject	Insufficient information provided to justify rezoning.	No

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested	Panel Recommendation	Panel Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to IPI?
	Heretaunga Co No2 Limited (late submission)					