



# Original and further submission points

## By Chapter / Topic

Variation 1 to the Proposed Porirua District Plan and Proposed  
Plan Change 19 to the Porirua City District Plan  
**November 2022**

# Contents

.....	1
1-General Approach > 1.3-District Plan framework > 1.3.2-Part 2 District-Wide Matters .....	19
1-General Approach > 1.6-How the District Plan works.....	19
1-General Approach > 1.6-How the District Plan works > 1.6.3-Qualifying matters.....	20
1-General Approach > 1.6-How the District Plan works > 1.6.7-Legal effect of rules.....	21
2-Definitions > 2.1-General.....	21
2-Definitions > 2.2-New Definition .....	23
2-Definitions > 2.20-Apartments .....	26
2-Definitions > 2.123-Juliet balcony .....	28
2-Definitions > 2.186-Qualifying matter .....	29
2-Definitions > 2.268-Well-functioning urban environment .....	30
3-HO - Housing Opportunities .....	31
3-HO - Housing Opportunities > 3.3-Strategic objectives > 3.3.2-HO-O2 Future housing supply	32
4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.2-New Provision .....	33
4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives .....	34
4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.2-UFD-O2 Urban land supply.....	35
4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.3-UFD-O3 Urban form	35
4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.6-UFD-O6 Quality urban design and place making.....	39
4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.7-UFD-O7 Well-functioning urban environment.....	40
5-INF - Infrastructure > 5.4-Policies > 5.4.1-INF-P1 The benefits of Regionally Significant Infrastructure .....	44
5-INF - Infrastructure > 5.6-Standards > 5.6.3-INF-S3 Height - Masts, antennas, lines and single pole support structures, anemometers and extreme weather devices (not regulated by the NESTF) .....	45
6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.5-Policies > 6.5.16-HH-P16 Height controls on sites surrounding heritage items and heritage settings .....	47
6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.5-Policies > 6.5.17-HH-P17 Increased height and/or height in relation to boundaries on sites surrounding heritage items and heritage settings.....	49
6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.6-HH-R6.....	52
6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.7-HH-R7.....	52

6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.8-HH-R8.....	53
6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.9-HH-R9.....	54
7-SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori > 7.4-Policies > 7.4.9-SASM-P9 Height controls on sites surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori .....	54
7-SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori > 7.4-Policies > 7.4.10-SASM-P10 Increased height and/or height in relation to boundary on sites surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori .....	57
7-SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori > 7.5-Rules > 7.5.4-SASM-R4 Any new building or structure, or extension of the footprint of an existing building or structure on a site or area listed in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.....	62
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.1-General .....	62
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.2-New Provision.....	68
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.3-Objectives > 8.3.2-SUB-O2 Servicing of allotments .....	70
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.1-SUB-P1 Creation of allotments.....	70
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.2-SUB-P2 Boundary adjustments .....	71
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.3-SUB-P3 Update of cross-lease titles.....	72
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.4-SUB-P4 Functioning of the transport network.....	73
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.5-SUB-P5 Integration with infrastructure .....	74
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.6-SUB-P6 Subdivision in the Residential Zones and Māori Purpose Zone (Hongoeka) .....	74
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.7-SUB-P7 Subdivision in the Future Urban Zone.....	76
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.1-SUB-R1 Boundary adjustments.....	77
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.2-SUB-R2 Updating of an existing crosslease title .....	78
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.3-SUB-R3 Subdivision that creates any vacant allotments.....	80
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created .....	82
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created > 8.5.4.1-Residential zones 1. Activity status: Controlled .....	84
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created > 8.5.4.3-All zones All Zones 3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	85
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings)	

approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created >	
8.5.4.4-All Zones All zones 4. Activity status: Discretionary .....	86
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.10-SUB-R10 Any subdivision within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites .	88
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.11-SUB-R11 Any subdivision within a site listed in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori .....	89
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.12-SUB-R12 Subdivision of a lot containing a Significant Natural Area.....	89
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.13-SUB-R13 Subdivision within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape .....	90
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.14-SUB-R14 Subdivision of a site containing a Coastal High Natural Character Area .....	91
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.15-SUB-R15 Subdivision of land to create new allotment(s) within the National Grid Corridor or National Grid Pauatahanui Substation Yard .....	92
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.17-SUB-R17 Subdivision adjoining existing Medium Density Residential Zone settlements within the Coastal Environment .....	93
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.6-Standards > 8.6.1-SUB-S1 Minimum allotment size and shape >	
8.6.1.1-SUB-Table 1 Minimum allotment size and shape .....	94
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.6-Standards > 8.6.5-SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal .....	96
8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.6-Standards > 8.6.6-SUB-S6 Stormwater management .....	97
9-NOISE - Noise .....	98
9-NOISE - Noise > 9.2-New Provision.....	99
9-NOISE - Noise > 9.5-Rules > 9.5.4-NOISE-R4 New buildings, change of use of existing buildings, and additions to existing buildings over 50m <sup>2</sup> , for use as residential units, supported residential care activities, retirement village or visitor accommodation in Commercial and Mixed Use and Industrial Zones.....	104
9-NOISE - Noise > 9.6-Standards > 9.6.5-NOISE-S5 Residential units, supported residential care activities, retirement village and visitor accommodation - Indoor noise design levels .....	107
9-NOISE - Noise > 9.6-Standards > 9.6.6-NOISE-S6 Residential units, supported residential care activity, retirement village and visitor accommodation - Mechanical ventilation.....	110
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones.....	113
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.1-General.....	117
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.2-New Provision .....	123
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.3-Objectives > 10.3.1-RESZ-O1 Housing Choice .....	127



10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.3-Objectives > 10.3.2-RESZ-O2 Purpose of Residential Zones .....	129
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.3-Objectives > 10.3.3-RESZ-O3 Sustainable, healthy and safe residential zones .....	132
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies.....	134
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.1-RESZ-P1 Residential activity .....	135
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.2-RESZ-P2 Medium Density Residential Standards.....	138
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.3-RESZ-P3 Safety and street scene quality.....	140
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.4-RESZ-P4 Health and well-being.....	141
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.5-RESZ-P5 Buildings and structures .....	143
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.6-RESZ-P6 Providing for development .....	147
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.7-RESZ-P7 Health and well-being - Development not meeting permitted activity standards .....	148
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.8-RESZ-P8 Urban built environment - Development not meeting permitted activity standards.....	153
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.9-RESZ-P9 Height Control - Shading.....	154
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.10-RESZ-P10 Urban built environment - Development not meeting permitted activity standard for number of residential units on a site.....	156
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.11-RESZ-P11 Non-residential activities.....	160
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.12-RESZ-P12 Commercial activity .....	163
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.13-RESZ-P13 Retirement villages .....	164
10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.14-RESZ-P14 Other activities.....	168
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone .....	169
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.1-General .....	174
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.2-New Provision .....	194

11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.3-Objective > 11.3.1-HRZ-O1 Planned urban built environment of the High Density Residential Zone.....	203
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.1-HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls.....	207
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.1-HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 11.4.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	210
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.1-HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 11.4.1.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	210
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.2-HRZ-R2 Construction activity ...	212
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.3-HRZ-R3 Rainwater tank.....	213
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.4-HRZ-R4 Fences and stand-alone walls .....	214
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.5-HRZ-R5 Residential activity, excluding papakāinga.....	215
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.6-HRZ-R6 Conservation activity ..	216
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.7-HRZ-R7 Customary harvesting .	218
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.8-HRZ-R8 Sport and recreation facility.....	219
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.9-HRZ-R9 Supported residential care activity.....	220
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.10-HRZ-R10 Home business.....	221
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.11-HRZ-R11 Educational facility, including home-based childcare services .....	222
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.12-HRZ-R12 Visitor accommodation .....	223
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.13-HRZ-R13 Papakāinga .....	224
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.14-HRZ-R14 Show home .....	226
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.15-HRZ-R15 Community garden .	227
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.16-HRZ-R16 Emergency service facility.....	228
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.16-HRZ-R16 Emergency service facility > 11.4.16.1-1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	229
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.17-HRZ-R17 Community facility, excluding healthcare activities and hospitals .....	230
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.18-HRZ-R18 Healthcare activity ..	231

11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.19-HRZ-R19 Retirement village...	232
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.20-HRZ-R20 Commercial activity	235
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.20-HRZ-R20 Commercial activity > 11.4.20.1-1. Activity status: Discretionary.....	236
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.21-HRZ-R21 Any activity not listed as a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity.....	239
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.22-HRZ-R22 Industrial activity ....	240
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.23-HRZ-R23 Rural industry.....	241
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.24-HRZ-R24 Hospital .....	242
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.25-HRZ-R25 Primary production.	243
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards.....	244
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.1-HRZ-S1 Number of residential units per site .....	245
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.2-HRZ-S2 Height.....	250
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.3-HRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary.....	263
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.4-HRZ-S4 Setbacks .....	267
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.5-HRZ-S5 Landscaped area ..	273
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.6-HRZ-S6 Outdoor living space - Per unit.....	276
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.7-HRZ-S7 Outlook space - Per unit .....	280
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.8-HRZ-S8 Windows to street	281
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.9-HRZ-S9 Rainwater tanks...	283
11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.10-HRZ-S10 Fences and standalone walls along boundaries .....	284
12-GRZ - General Residential Zone > 12.1-General .....	287
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone .....	288
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.1-General .....	289
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.2-New Provision.....	309
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective.....	315
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.1-MRZ-O1 Planned urban built environment of the Medium Density Residential Zone .....	316
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.2-MRZ-PREC02-O1 Planned urban built environment of the MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct.....	320

13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.3-MRZ-PREC02-O2 Managing scale of development at MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct Interface .....	323
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.4-MRZ-PREC03-O1 Recognition of development constraints of natural environmental overlays in the Takapūwāhia Precinct .....	326
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules .....	327
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.1-MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls ..	328
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.1-MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 13.4.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	332
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.1-MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 13.4.1.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	333
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.2-MRZ-R2 Construction activity .....	335
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.3-MRZ-R3 Rainwater tank....	336
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.4-MRZ-R4 Fences and stand- alone walls .....	337
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.5-MRZ-R5 Residential activity, excluding papakāinga.....	338
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.6-MRZ-R6 Conservation activity .....	339
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.7-MRZ-R7 Customary harvesting .....	340
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.8-MRZ-R8 Sport and recreation facility.....	341
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.9-MRZ-R9 Supported residential care activity > 13.4.9.1-1. Activity status: Permitted.....	342
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.9-MRZ-R9 Supported residential care activity > 13.4.9.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	344
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.10-MRZ-R10 Home business	345
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.11-MRZ-R11 Educational facility, including home-based childcare services .....	347
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.12-MRZ-R12 Visitor accommodation .....	348
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.13-MRZ-R13 Papakāinga.....	349

13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.14-MRZ-R14 Show home .....	352
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.15-MRZ-R15 Community garden .....	353
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.16-MRZ-R16 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard.....	354
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.17-MRZ-R17 Activities within the National Grid Yard .....	357
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.18-MRZ-R18 Activities within the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor.....	358
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.19-MRZ-R19 Emergency service facility.....	359
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.20-MRZ-R20 Community facility, excluding healthcare activities and hospitals .....	361
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.21-MRZ-R21 Healthcare activity .....	362
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.22-MRZ-R22 Retirement village .....	363
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.23-MRZ-R23 Commercial activity.....	365
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.24-MRZ-R24 Any activity not listed as a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity.....	367
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.25-MRZ-R25 Industrial activity .....	368
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.26-MRZ-R26 Rural industry .	369
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.27-MRZ-R27 Hospital .....	370
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.28-MRZ-R28 Primary production .....	371
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards.....	372
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.1-MRZ-S1 Number of residential units per site .....	374
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.2-MRZ-S2 Height .....	380
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.3-MRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary.....	393
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.4-MRZ-S4 Building coverage.....	397
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.5-MRZ-S5 Setbacks.....	400

13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.6-MRZ-S6 Landscaped area .....	403
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.7-MRZ-S7 Outdoor living space - Per unit .....	406
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.8-MRZ-S8 Outlook space - Per unit.....	409
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.9-MRZ-S9 Windows to street.....	411
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.10-MRZ-S10 Rainwater tanks.....	413
13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.11-MRZ-S11 Fences and standalone walls along boundaries .....	415
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.1-General .....	418
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.2-New Provision.....	425
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.3-Objectives > 14.3.1-NCZ-O1 Purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone .....	429
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.3-Objectives > 14.3.2-NCZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone.....	430
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.3-Objectives > 14.3.3-NCZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at Zone interface.....	431
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.1-NCZ-P1 Appropriate activities	433
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.2-NCZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units.....	434
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.3-NCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units.....	438
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.4-NCZ-P4 Other activities .....	441
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.5-NCZ-P5 Inappropriate activities .....	442
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.6-NCZ-P6 Built development.....	443
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.7-NCZ-P7 Public space interface	445
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.8-NCZ-P8 Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones.....	446
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.1-NCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures.....	448
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.1-NCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 14.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	451

14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.10-NCZ-R10 Supported residential care activity > 14.5.10.1-1. Activity status: Permitted.....	452
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.10-NCZ-R10 Supported residential care activity > 14.5.10.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	453
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.13-NCZ-R13 Papakāinga.....	455
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.14-NCZ-R14 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga .....	456
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.15-NCZ-R15 Emergency service facility.....	457
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.20-NCZ-R20 Retirement village ....	458
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.1-NCZ-S1 Height .....	459
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.2-NCZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary.....	460
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.3-NCZ-S3 Setback .....	463
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.4-NCZ-S4 Active frontages.....	465
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.5-NCZ-S5 Location of residential units .....	466
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.6-NCZ-S6 Outdoor living space .....	467
14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.7-NCZ-S7 Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas .....	468
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.1-General .....	470
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.2-New Provision .....	481
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.3-Objectives > 15.3.1-LCZ-O1 Purpose of the Local Centre Zone .....	484
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.3-Objectives > 15.3.2-LCZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Local Centre Zone.....	485
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.3-Objectives > 15.3.3-LCZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at Zone interface .....	486
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies .....	489
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.1-LCZ-P1 Appropriate activities.....	490
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.2-LCZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units .....	491
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.3-LCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units.....	495
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.4-LCZ-P4 Other activities .....	496

15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.5-LCZ-P5 Inappropriate activities .....	500
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.6-LCZ-P6 Small scale built development .....	501
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.7-LCZ-P7 Larger scale built development....	502
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.8-LCZ-P8 Height variation Control .....	506
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.9-LCZ-P9 Public space interface.....	507
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.10-LCZ-P10 Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones .....	508
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.1-LCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures .....	510
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.1-LCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 15.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	514
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.11-LCZ-R11 Supported residential care activity .....	515
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.12-LCZ-R12 Community corrections activity...	516
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.15-LCZ-R15 Papakāinga.....	517
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.16-LCZ-R16 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 15.5.16.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	519
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.16-LCZ-R16 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 15.5.16.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary.....	520
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.18-LCZ-R18 Emergency service facility .....	522
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.19-LCZ-R19 Retirement village.....	522
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.1-LCZ-S1 Height .....	523
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.2-LCZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary .	526
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.3-LCZ-S3 Setback .....	529
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.4-LCZ-S4 Active street frontages .....	532
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.5-LCZ-S5 Location of residential units .....	533
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.6-LCZ-S6 Outdoor living space.....	534
15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.7-LCZ-S7 Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas.....	535
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.1-General .....	536
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.2-New Provision.....	540
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.3-Objectives.....	542
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.3-Objectives > 16.3.2-LFRZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Large Format Retail Zone .....	543



16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.3-Objectives > 16.3.3-LFRZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at zone interface .....	544
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.2-LFRZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units.....	546
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.3-LFRZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units.....	547
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.4-LFRZ-P4 Other activities .....	549
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.5-LFRZ-P5 Inappropriate activities .	549
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.7-LFRZ-P7 Larger scale built development.....	550
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.8-LFRZ-P8 Public space interface ...	553
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.9-LFRZ-P9 Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones.....	555
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.1-LFRZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 16.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	555
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.5-LFRZ-R5 Drive-through activity.....	556
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.7-LFRZ-R7 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 16.5.7.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	557
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.7-LFRZ-R7 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 16.5.7.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary..	558
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.7-LFRZ-R7 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 16.5.7.3-3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary..	560
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.8-LFRZ-R8 Supported residential care activity.....	561
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.12-LFRZ-R12 Papakāinga .....	563
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.22-LFRZ-R22 Emergency service facility .....	563
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.1-LFRZ-S1 Height .....	564
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.2-LFRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary .....	566
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.8-LFRZ-S8 Location of residential units .....	567
16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.9-LFRZ-S9 Outdoor living space .	568
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.1-General .....	569
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.2-New Provision.....	573

17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.3-Objectives > 17.3.1-MUZ-O1 Purpose of the Mixed Use Zone .....	576
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.3-Objectives > 17.3.2-MUZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Mixed Use Zone .....	577
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.3-Objectives > 17.3.3-MUZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at zone interface.....	579
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies .....	581
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.1-MUZ-P1 Appropriate activities.....	582
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.2-MUZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units .....	583
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.3-MUZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units.....	587
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.4-MUZ-P4 Other activities .....	588
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.5-MUZ-P5 Inappropriate activities .....	591
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.6-MUZ-P6 Small scale built development ....	593
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.7-MUZ-P7 Larger scale built development...	594
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.8-MUZ-P8 Height increase .....	597
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.9-MUZ-P9 Public space interface .....	598
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.10-MUZ-P10 Interface with Residential and Open Space Zones.....	599
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.1-MUZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures .....	600
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.1-MUZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 17.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	605
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.14-MUZ-R14 Supported residential care activity .....	606
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.15-MUZ-R15 Community corrections activity .	607
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.18-MUZ-R18 Papakāinga .....	608
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.19-MUZ-R19 Residential activity and residential unit, ;excluding papakāinga > 17.5.19.1-1. Activity status: Permitted.....	609
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.19-MUZ-R19 Residential activity and residential unit, ;excluding papakāinga > 17.5.19.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary .....	610
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.20-MUZ-R21 Retirement village .....	612
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.23-MUZ-R24 Emergency service facility .....	613
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.1-MUZ-S1 Height .....	613

17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.2-MUZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary	616
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.3-MUZ-S3 Setback .....	617
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.4-MUZ-S4 Active street frontage .....	619
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.5-MUZ-S5 Outdoor living space .....	620
17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.6-MUZ-S6 Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas.....	621
18-CCZ- City Centre Zone > 18.1-General .....	622
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.1-General .....	623
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.2-New Provision.....	635
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.3-Objectives > 19.3.1-MCZ-O1 Purpose of the Metropolitan Centre Zone .....	639
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.3-Objectives > 19.3.2-MCZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone .....	640
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.1-MCZ-P1 Appropriate activities ..	643
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.2-MCZ-P2 Location of residential activity.....	644
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.3-MCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity.....	645
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.4-MCZ-P4 Other activities .....	647
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.5-MCZ-P5 Inappropriate activities	652
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.6-MCZ-P6 Small scale built development.....	654
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.7-MCZ-P7 Large scale built development.....	655
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.8-MCZ-P8 Public space interface..	659
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.9-MCZ-P9 Car parking and parking lots.....	660
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.1-MCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures.....	662
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.1-MCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 19.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	666
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.12-MCZ-R12 Residential activity > 19.5.12.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary.....	667
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.13-MCZ-R13 Supported residential care activity.....	670

19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.14-MCZ-R14 Community corrections activities .....	671
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.17-MCZ-R17 Papakāinga .....	672
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.18-MCZ-R18 Large format retail activity .....	673
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.19-MCZ-R19 Supermarket .....	674
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.20-MCZ-R20 Emergency service facility .....	676
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.21-MCZ-R21 Retirement village.....	676
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.25-MCZ-R25 Drive-through activity .	677
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.1-MCZ-S1 Height.....	678
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.2-MCZ-S2 Active street frontages .....	680
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.3-MCZ-S3 Addressing Porirua Stream.....	681
19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.4-MCZ-S4 Location of residential units .....	683
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.1-General.....	684
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.2-New Provision .....	685
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.3-Objectives > 20.3.1-GIZ-O1 Purpose of the General Industrial Zone .....	688
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.3-Objectives > 20.3.2-GIZ-O2 Planned urban environment of the General Industrial Zone .....	689
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.4-Policies > 20.4.1-GIZ-P1 Appropriate use and development.....	691
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.5-Rules > 20.5.1-GIZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 20.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted .....	692
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.5-Rules > 20.5.14-GIZ-R14 Emergency service facility ...	692
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.6-Standards > 20.6.1-GIZ-S1 Building height .....	693
20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.6-Standards > 20.6.6-GIZ-S6 Fences and standalone walls .....	694
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area .....	695
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.1-General.....	703
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.2-New Provision .....	734
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.3-Urban form.....	735

21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.6-Recreation areas .....	736
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.7-Freshwater Management Areas ..	737
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.8-Connectivity .....	738
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.9-Objectives > 21.9.1-DEV-NG-O1 Purpose of the Northern Growth Development Area .....	739
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.9-Objectives > 21.9.2-DEV-NG-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Northern Growth Development Area .....	740
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.9-Objectives > 21.9.3-DEV-NG-O3 Provision of infrastructure .....	749
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.1-DEV-NG-P1 Use and development.....	750
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.2-DEV-NG-P2 Subdivision .....	751
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.3-DEV-NG-P3 Potentially appropriate development .....	759
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.4-DEV-NG-P4 Inappropriate development.....	763
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules.....	766
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.1-DEV-NG-R1 Activities (excluding subdivision) that are permitted activities in the underlying zone > 21.11.1.1-All zones 1. Activity status: Permitted.....	767
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.2-DEV-NG-R2 Earthworks that are permitted activities in the Earthworks chapter.....	770
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.3-DEV-NG-R3 Subdivision of land within the Northern Growth Development Area .....	772
21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.5-DEV-NG-Figure 1 Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan.....	775
22-HOSZ - Hospital Zone > 22.1-General .....	778
22-HOSZ - Hospital Zone > 22.3-Objectives > 22.3.3-HOSZ-O3 Adverse effects of activities ....	779
22-HOSZ - Hospital Zone > 22.4-Policies > 22.4.5-HOSZ-P5 Inappropriate activities.....	780
23-APP3 - Residential Design Guide > 23.1-General .....	781
29-APP17 - Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer Areas.....	782
29-APP17 - Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer Areas > 29.1-General.....	784
30-SCHED7 - Significant Natural Areas > 30.1-General .....	786
31-Planning Maps > 31.1-General .....	786
31-Planning Maps > 31.2-New Provision.....	814

31-Planning Maps > 31.4-Retain Zoning .....	819
31-Planning Maps > 31.5-Rezoning .....	824
31-Planning Maps > 31.6-Precinct Mapping.....	878
31-Planning Maps > 31.7-Northern Growth Development Area Mapping .....	880
31-Planning Maps > 31.8-Height Control Mapping .....	883
31-Planning Maps > 31.9-Residential Intensification Precinct Mapping.....	892
31-Planning Maps > 31.10-Flood Hazard Mapping .....	896
31-Planning Maps > 31.11-Natural Hazards Mapping.....	912
31-Planning Maps > 31.12-Active Street Frontage Mapping.....	926
31-Planning Maps > 31.17-High Density Residential Zone .....	926
31-Planning Maps > 31.18-Medium Density Residential Zone.....	947
32-General > 32.1-General .....	951
32-General > 32.2-New provision .....	1086
32-General > 32.3-Infrastructure.....	1113
32-General > 32.5-Commercial Zones .....	1142
32-General > 32.6-National Policy Statement for Urban Development.....	1152
32-General > 32.8-Design Guides .....	1153
32-General > 32.9-Section 32 Evaluation Report .....	1178
32-General > 32.10-Notification preclusion .....	1181
32-General > 32.11-Significant Natural Areas .....	1182
32-General > 32.13-Hazards and Risks .....	1191
32-General > 32.14-Earthworks.....	1198
32-General > 32.17-Consultation.....	1199
32-General > 32.18-Whole plan.....	1203
32-General > 32.19-Non-regulatory .....	1208
32-General > 32.21-Plimmerton Farm.....	1216
32-General > 32.22-Climate Change.....	1320
32-General > 32.24-Multiple Zones .....	1325
32-General > 32.25-Walkable Catchment .....	1327
32-General > 32.26-Approach to Intensification .....	1334
32-General > 32.27-Qualifying Matters.....	1367

## 1-General Approach > 1.3-District Plan framework > 1.3.2-Part 2 District-Wide Matters

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.4	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the text that refers to 'qualifying matters'.	Supports the introductory text and reference to qualifying matters as it assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA.
FS17.615	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS73.18	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the text that refers to 'qualifying matters'.	Support reference to qualifying matters in the introductory text of the Proposed Variation.

## 1-General Approach > 1.6-How the District Plan works

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS73.10	Radio New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>Insert a list of "qualifying matters" in the Proposed Variation.</p> <p>As drafted, the presence of a qualifying matter is not evident until applying the specific rule to which it relates. By indicating the range of qualifying matters upfront, this would provide greater plan certainty and consistency.</p>	At present, there is no clearly prescribed list of qualifying matters, nor the reasons for their inclusion in the Proposed Variation.

FS17.319	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
----------	-----------------	---------	---	---

## 1-General Approach > 1.6-How the District Plan works > 1.6.3- Qualifying matters

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.5	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the reference to qualifying matters and the accompanying explanation as to how and when they apply.	Supports the introductory text and reference to qualifying matters as it assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA.
FS17.616	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS73.17	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Accept the submission	Support reference to qualifying matters and an explanation of how and when they apply in the introductory text of the Proposed Variation.
OS73.11	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	New qualifying matter  <u>"Radiocommunication Transmission – requires modification to permitted building and structure heights to manage the effects of electromagnetic radiation."</u>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.320	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.380	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter.



## 1-General Approach > 1.6-How the District Plan works > 1.6.7- Legal effect of rules

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.6	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the introductory text relating to legal effect and qualifying matters.	Supports the explanatory text relating to legal effect and the application of qualifying matters. The text assists with plan interpretation and application.
FS17.617	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 2-Definitions > 2.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.7	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Definitions – Small changes are sought, including a new definition for Rapid Transit Stop.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and</li> </ul>

				<p>considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.675	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.74	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.40	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.14	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 2-Definitions > 2.2-New Definition

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.8	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>Insert a definition for QUALIFYING MATTER AREA as follows:</p> <p><u>Qualifying matter area means a qualifying matter listed below:</u></p> <p><u>(a) The National Grid Yard</u></p> <p><u>(b) The National Grid Subdivision Corridor</u></p>	<p>The concept of Qualifying matters was introduced within the RMA-EHS. As defined by section 771 and 770 of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); and</li> </ul>

			<u>..... (other qualifying matters to be listed)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>Given the role and importance of qualifying matter areas to the implementation of the RMA, supports the definition of 'qualifying matter' within Variation 1, but submits it would be of further benefit to plan users to provide a clear list as to what are qualifying matter areas in the PDP, and specifically, provide explicit reference to the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor as a qualifying matter area. To differentiate between the RMA provided definition of 'qualifying matter', a definition of 'qualifying matter area' is proposed.</p>
FS17.619	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.364	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as it considers that it is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan.
OS58.26	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add new definition:</p> <p><b><u>Temporary Emergency Services Training Activity</u></b></p> <p><i>means a temporary activity undertaken for the training of any component of FENZ New Zealand for any emergency purpose. An emergency purpose are those purposes which enable FENZ New Zealand to achieve its main functions under</i></p>	<p>New definition for 'Temporary emergency services training activity' provides greater clarity to plan users and supports the relief sought elsewhere in this feedback.</p> <p>Firefighter training is an essential activity and may include live fire training and equipment training both on and off site. The Statement of Performance Expectations (SPE) 2021/22 confirms a commitment to the Government that all firefighters achieve a certain level of training.</p>

			<a href="#"><u>sections 11 and 12 of the FENZ New Zealand Act 2017.</u></a>	
FS17.159	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.74	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<i>Proposed new definition</i>  <b><u>Rapid Transit Stop</u></b>  <a href="#"><u>Has the meaning in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, and for the avoidance of doubt includes any railway station with regularly scheduled passenger services.</u></a>	Seeks the introduction of a new definition for "Rapid Transit Stop". This definition aligns with that proposed in Hutt City Council and is consistent with the outcomes sought by the NPD-UD.
FS17.742	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS81.43	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Allow	Waka Kotahi supports the inclusion of a definition for Rapid Transit Stop. This will aid plan user interpretation and is consistent with the definition under the National Policy Statement- Urban Development (NPS-UD).
FS99.107	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.81	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.53	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Add the following 'retirement unit' definition:  <b><u>Retirement Unit</u></b> <u>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.</u>	A 'retirement unit' definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.
FS67.55	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 2-Definitions > 2.20-Apartments

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.71	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	means any <del>multi-unit housing</del> development that includes upper level <u>residential</u> units, each of which is typically but not necessarily one storey high, and which includes shared vertical access to groups of units.	Seeks amendments to remove reference to "multi-unit housing". Notes this term is proposed for deletion through Variation 1.

FS17.739	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.104	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.78	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 2-Definitions > 2.123-Juliet balcony

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.72	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes that this new term provides for greater flexibility in regard to provision of onsite open space.
FS17.740	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.105	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.79	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the



				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	--

## 2-Definitions > 2.186-Qualifying matter

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.7	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the definition of qualifying matter.	Supports the definition of ‘qualifying matter’ as it highlights to plan users the existence of the matters. The definition reflects that provided within the RMA.
FS17.618	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS73.19	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Accept the submission to insert new definition of “qualifying matter area” and include the following in the list:  <i><u>x. Radio communication Transmission – requires modification to permitted building and structure heights to manage the effects of electromagnetic radiation.</u></i>	Support. Agree that it would provide greater clarity to plan users if the Proposed Variation included a list of “qualifying matters”.
FS73.23	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Accept the submission.	RNZ support use of the definition provided within the RMA, provided there is also more specificity as to the qualifying matters that apply in Porirua.
OS76.73	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes that this definition is consistent with section 2 of the RMA.
FS17.741	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.106	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.80	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 2-Definitions > 2.268-Well-functioning urban environment

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.75	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes it is consistent with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.
FS17.743	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.108	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.82	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS118.52	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Delete the definition of 'well-functioning urban environment' as notified.</p>	<p>Opposes the definition of 'well-functioning urban environment'. Policy 1 of the NPS-UD provides a description of what constitutes a well-functioning urban environment. It is inappropriate to include it as a definition when it is intended to be a Policy and drafted as such. It will lead to interpretation issues and uncertainty when the Plan is applied.</p>
FS67.54	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	<p>Submitter requests point be allowed.</p>	

## 3-HO - Housing Opportunities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.4	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain HO-O2.	Supports retention of HO-O2 insofar as it requires higher density housing be to enabled on sites where it has access to the transport network and avoids areas of significant natural hazard risk. The Proposed District Plan defines 'natural hazard' to include fire.
FS17.137	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 3-HO - Housing Opportunities > 3.3-Strategic objectives > 3.3.2-HO-O2 Future housing supply

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.76	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Delete Strategic Objective, as notified.	Supports the deletion of this strategic objective, noting that instead a new HRZ chapter has been introduced through the variation.
FS17.744	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.109	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.83	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.43	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Add another objective indigenising urban form and development in which at the moment its visibility is minimal and the acknowledgement of whakapapa in these spaces are a much-needed objective. In a way (UFD) could give priority to this and acknowledge as an objective	There is not any material or reference in the UFD that shows how urban form and development will take its inspirations from Te Ao Māori especially Ngāti Toa Rangatira as the Tangata Whenua.
FS17.571	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.170	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek relief to ensure provisions enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and	Greater Wellington support amendments to the UFD chapter which require new development to enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms by

			their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	providing for mana whenua / tangata whenua and their relationship with their culture, land, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. This would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS127.434	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS56.2	John Cody	Amend	Amend UFD-07 or add as UFD-08:  <u>'Affordable housing. Enable a sufficient supply and diverse range of dwelling types and sizes that meet the housing needs of people and communities, including (a) households on low to moderate incomes; and (b) people with special housing requirements.'</u>	The wording is suggested because there is precedent e.g. in the Auckland Unitary Plan. The policy relates to 'all people' in Objective 1. A more refined policy might include recognition of assets given that some specific provisions in the proposed Plan have asset thresholds e.g. entry to retirement villages
FS17.642	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.2-UFD-O2 Urban land supply

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.54	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain deletion.	This objective does not align with the MDRS in terms of where higher density housing is enabled.
FS67.56	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.3-UFD-O3 Urban form

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted	Supports UFD-O3 insofar as it promotes urban form which is accessible and safe.
FS17.138	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.77	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Porirua has an urban form which is:  1. Characterised by a range of intensity of built form, depending on an area's proximity to the metropolitan centre, train stations, <u>town centre</u> and local centres; and	Generally supports the changes to this strategic objective but restates its position that the matters contained within do not form a Qualifying Matter in which to limit application of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD. Kāinga Ora seeks a small amendment to reflect the broader submission seeking the introduction of a Town Centre Zone (Mana).

			2. Connected, accessible and safe and supports the community's wellbeing.	
FS17.745	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.179	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	<p>Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone.</p> <p>The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment.</p> <p>The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>



FS99.110	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.84	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.12	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective as it provides for an urban form that is connected, accessible and safe. This is consistent with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1046	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.47	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission

OS118.55	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend UFD-O3 to acknowledge that the intensity of built form is not only to be determined by proximity to centres and train stations.	Supports the recognition of the need for a range of intensity of built form throughout the district. The characterisation of built form in urban areas will not only be informed by the proximity of development to centres and train stations, but also the characteristics of individual sites and the functional needs of particular types of development. Larger sites may support a greater intensity of built form as explained in the submission above. Retirement villages need to be located in all residential zones as explained in the submission above.
FS67.57	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.6-UFD-O6 Quality urban design and place making

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.78	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective, and in doing so, restates its position that provisions of the Plan should outline the design outcomes being sought, and design guides should be non-statutory tools to assist in the assessment of such matters.
FS17.746	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.111	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.85	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.56	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend UFD-O6 as follows, to remove uncertainty surrounding what a 'healthy urban environment' encompasses:  <b>UFD-O6 Quality urban design and place making</b> Good quality <del>design</del> <u>development</u> contributes to a well-functioning <del>and</del> healthy urban environment in Porirua.	UFD-O6's provision for good quality design that contributes to a well-functioning urban environment generally aligns with MDRS Objective 1 and Policy 5. Drafting amendments are required for greater alignment. The reference to a 'healthy urban environment' is somewhat ambiguous, and this term is not defined elsewhere in the District Plan, meaning the objective as currently drafted does not provide clear expectations / guidance for what the 'healthy urban environment' expectations comprise. UFD-07 provides sufficient guidance and direction surrounding wellbeing, health and safety. Th reference to a 'healthy urban environment' in UFD-06 is unnecessary.
FS67.58	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 4-UFD - Urban Form and Development > 4.3-Strategic objectives > 4.3.7-UFD-07 Well-functioning urban environment

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.9	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Strategic Objective UFD-07	Supports the strategic objective, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety.

FS17.620	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS58.6	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Retain as drafted.	Supports UDF-O7 insofar as it promotes a well-functioning urban environment which provides for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities.
FS17.139	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend UFD-O7 (well-functioning urban environment) and other relevant policies in the Variation to include environmental components of wellbeing and have regard to the articulation of a well-functioning urban environment set out in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside</p>

				from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.328	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.32	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS76.79	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports, noting it draws directly from Obj 1 of the NPS-UD

FS17.747	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.112	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.86	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.13	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective as it provides for a well-functioning urban environment and is consistent with Objective 1 of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1047	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.48	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission

OS118.57	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain UFD-07 as notified.	Supports UFD-07 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.
FS67.59	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 5-INF - Infrastructure > 5.4-Policies > 5.4.1-INF-P1 The benefits of Regionally Significant Infrastructure

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.18	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend INF-P1 to reflect low and zero carbon regionally significant infrastructure	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>
FS17.343	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.47	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required and seeks to be involved with the development of the policy.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the submission point. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available



				to understand the implications of what is proposed, and how it will be given effect to.
--	--	--	--	---

## 5-INF - Infrastructure > 5.6-Standards > 5.6.3-INF-S3 Height - Masts, antennas, lines and single pole support structures, anemometers and extreme weather devices (not regulated by the NESTF)

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS33.1	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited and Vodafone New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Amend height limits in INF-S3, so that telecommunications facilities in all zones in this standard are permitted at a height of at least 5m above the maximum height of structures for the underlying zone. Clarification that the maximum height does not include lightning rods.</p> <p>Suggested amendments:  <i>INF-S3 Height (excluding lightning rods from this height limit) – Masts, antennas, lines and single pole support structures, anemometers and extreme weather devices (not regulated by the NESTF)</i></p> <p><i>Local Centre Zone</i>  <i>Mixed Use Zone</i>  <i>Neighbourhood Centre Zone</i>  <i>Metropolitan Centre Zone</i></p>	<p>Amendment is sought as this is required for operational reasons, while not giving rise to additional adverse effects. Typically, a telecommunication facility should be at least 3m to 5m above adjacent buildings. This height is required for a number of reasons, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site antennas must be high enough to enable a device to have a reasonable line of site to provide certainty of network coverage and capacity to service customer needs; and</li> <li>• Radiofrequency emission compliance with NESTF regulation 55.</li> </ul>

			<p><i>Residential Zones</i></p> <p><i>Hospital Zone</i></p> <p><i>1. It must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of <del>3.5m</del><u>5m</u> above the maximum height of structures for the underlying zone. (single provider).</i></p> <p><i><del>2. It must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of 5m above the maximum height of structures for the underlying zone (two or more providers).</del></i></p> <p><i>[...]</i></p> <p><i>Large Format Retail Zone</i></p> <p><i>3. It must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of <del>25m</del><u>27m</u> (single provider).</i></p>	<p>A higher height (e.g. 5m above surrounding buildings) can be required in order to provide sufficient coverage to areas directly surrounding or close to the telecommunications facility. Increased building heights proposed in Variation 1 have the potential to impact the performance of existing telecommunication facilities and result in additional costs for telecommunication providers. Sufficient height limits therefore need to be provided to allow for new facilities to be effective, and for the upgrading of existing facilities. The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act has the potential to result in \$100 million dollars in additional costs for Spark throughout the country due to increased building heights proposed. Size and diameter requirements for antenna in INF-S6 for different zones will ensure adequate levels of amenity in this regard and therefore an additional 1.5m in height is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>In terms of lightning rods, it is requested that it is clarified that these are excluded from the measurement of height. This will provide alignment with the approach to this matter in the NESTF. Given the small-scale nature of these structures these need not be included in the maximum height.</p>
FS17.82	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.5-Policies > 6.5.16-HH-P16 Height controls on sites surrounding heritage items and heritage settings

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.61	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain as notified.	Submitter supports the inclusion of this new qualifying matter to manage the potential effects of intensification on heritage items and heritage settings, as it gives effect to Operative RPS Policy 22, which is in regard to protecting historic heritage values in regional and district plans
FS17.386	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.80	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Limit the <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as <del>Height Control – Heritage A, B or C and/or</del> Height in Relation to Boundary Control– Heritage A or B, to ensure that the physical, social and surrounding heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage items (Group B) are protected.	Supports and recognises the importance of appropriately managing development adjacent to these sites to protect and maintain the identified historic heritage values. In this regard, supports the use of a HIRB control on adjoining sites. Considers that this tool will satisfactorily apply an appropriate setback from sites with identified values and manage resulting effects. Opposes the additional height control.

FS17.748	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.112	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.113	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.87	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.5-Policies > 6.5.17-HH-P17 Increased height and/or height in relation to boundaries on sites surrounding heritage items and heritage settings

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.62	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain as notified.	Submitter supports the inclusion of this new qualifying matter to manage the potential effects of intensification on heritage items and heritage settings, as it gives effect to Operative RPS Policy 22, which is in regard to protecting historic heritage values in regional and district plans
FS17.387	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.81	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><b>HH-P17 - Increased <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundaries on sites surrounding heritage items and heritage settings</b></p> <p>Only allow an increase in <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as <del>Height Control – Heritage A, B or C and/or</del> Height in Relation to Boundary Control – Heritage A or B, where it can be demonstrated that the physical, social and surroundings heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings in</p>	Generally supports and recognises the importance of appropriately managing development adjacent to these sites to protect and maintain the identified historic heritage values. In this regard, supports the use of a restrictive HIRB control on adjoining sites. Considers that this tool will satisfactorily apply an appropriate setback from sites with identified values and manage resulting effects. Kāinga Ora opposes the additional height control.

		<p>SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A), and SCHED3 - Historic Heritage items (Group B), will be protected and maintained having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The physical, social and/or surroundings heritage values of the heritage item and heritage setting and its significance;</li> <li>2. Whether any increase in the <del>height</del> <del>and/or</del> height in relation to boundary of the building or structure would dominate and/or detract from the heritage item and heritage setting, diminish the recognition of the heritage item as a local landmark/focal point, or diminish the relationship with neighbouring heritage items and heritage settings taking into account: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The degree of contrast in scale of the building or structure with the heritage item;</li> <li>b. The extent of any loss of views to the heritage item and heritage setting from the adjoining street; and</li> <li>c. Adverse effects on any visual connections with neighbouring heritage items and heritage settings;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>3. Any measures to minimise the visual impacts and effects on the appreciation of the heritage item and heritage setting through the specific location, scale, mass and/or design of the building or structure; and</p> <p>4. Any assessment or advice from a suitably qualified and experienced heritage expert.</p>	
FS17.749	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.113	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.114	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.88	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.6-HH-R6

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.7	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports HH-R6 insofar as it allows fire protection upgrades to heritage items as a controlled activity and considers the matters of control, which primarily relate to the effects on amenity, are permissive for fire protection works.
FS17.140	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.7-HH-R7

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.8	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports HH-R7 to HH-R9 insofar as new buildings, structures, or extensions are a restricted discretionary activity and considers the matters of discretion, which



				primarily relate to the effect on amenity and heritage values, do not prohibit the ability to establish fire stations within a heritage setting.
FS17.141	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.8-HH-R8

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.9	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports HH-R7 to HH-R9 insofar as new buildings, structures, or extensions are a restricted discretionary activity and considers the matters of discretion, which primarily relate to the effect on amenity and heritage values, do not prohibit the ability to establish fire stations within a heritage setting.
FS17.142	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 6-HH - Historic Heritage > 6.6-Rules > 6.6.9-HH-R9

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.10	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports HH-R7 to HH-R9 insofar as new buildings, structures, or extensions are a restricted discretionary activity and considers the matters of discretion, which primarily relate to the effect on amenity and heritage values, do not prohibit the ability to establish fire stations within a heritage setting.
FS17.143	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 7-SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori > 7.4-Policies > 7.4.9-SASM-P9 Height controls on sites surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.87	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend SASM-P9 as follows:  <b>SASM-P9 Height controls on sites surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori</b>	Submitter supports the inclusion of a new qualifying matter, to require setbacks for buildings and structures adjacent to sites and areas of significance for Māori.  Submitter requests a number of amendments to SASM-P9 to ensure the

			<p><del>Limit the height and/or height in relation to boundary</del> Require a setback for buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as Height Control – SASM and/or Height in relation to Boundary Control – SASM when these sites are adjacent to <del>to ensure that the values of sites and areas of significance in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to recognise and provide for the protection of Māori values are protected</del></p>	<p>intent of the provision more accurately gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 48 of the RPS, which directs that plans give particular regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and Waitangi Tribunal reports and settlement decisions relating to the Wellington region.</li> <li>• Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognize and provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga; mauri, particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters; mahinga kai and areas of natural resources used for customary purposes; and places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua.</li> <li>• Policies 21, 22 and 46.</li> </ul>
FS17.412	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.82	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Limit the <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as <del>Height Control – SASM and/or</del> Height in relation to Boundary Control – SASM to ensure that the values of sites and areas of</p>	Supports and recognises the importance of appropriately managing development adjacent to these sites to protect and maintain the identified values. In this regard, supports the use of a restrictive HIRB control on adjoining sites. Considers that this tool will satisfactorily apply an appropriate setback from sites with

			significance in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are protected	identified values and manage resulting effects. Kāinga Ora opposes the additional height control.
FS17.750	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.121	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS99.115	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.72	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the deletion of height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori disallowed.	We oppose the deletion of additional height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori because these controls would protect sites of significance from adverse effects of development.
FS127.89	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 7-SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori > 7.4-Policies > 7.4.10-SASM-P10 Increased height and/or height in relation to boundary on sites surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.64	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend SASM-P10 as follows:  <b><u>"SASM-P10 - Increased height and/or height in relation to boundary on Buildings and structures within setbacks from sites"</u></b>	Submitter supports the inclusion of a new qualifying matter, to require setbacks for buildings and structures adjacent to sites and areas of significance for Māori.  Submitter requests a number of amendments to SASM-P10 to ensure the

		<p><u>surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori</u></p> <p><u>Only allow an increase in height and/or height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as Height Control – SASM and/or Height in Relation to Boundary Control – SASM within setbacks from sites and areas of significance in SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance where the buildings and structures will provide for tino rangatiratanga for Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira. it can be demonstrated that the values of the site or area in SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori will be protected and maintained, having regard to:</u></p> <p><del>1. Whether any increase in height and/or height in relation to boundary of the building or structure would dominate the site or area, and/or the values of the site or area would be diminished taking into account:</del></p> <p><del>a. The degree of contrast in scale;</del></p> <p><del>b. The degree of any loss of visual connections between sites or areas in SCHED6 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori;</del></p> <p><del>2. Values articulated by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira through an assessment of</del></p>	<p>intent of the provision more accurately gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 48 of the RPS, which directs that plans give particular regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and Waitangi Tribunal reports and settlement decisions relating to the Wellington region, and</li> <li>• Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognize and provide for the exercise of kaitiakitanga; mauri, particularly in relation to fresh and coastal waters; mahinga kai and areas of natural resources used for customary purposes; and places, sites and areas with significant spiritual or cultural historic heritage value to tangata whenua.</li> <li>• Policies 21, 22 and 46.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			environmental effects, cultural impact assessment or iwi planning documents; and 3. Any alternative methods to avoid or reduce the impact on the values associated with the site or area including through the location, scale, mass, and/or design of the building or structure.”	
FS17.389	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.83	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  SASM-P10 - Increased <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundary on sites surrounding sites and areas of significance to Māori  Only allow an increase in <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as <del>Height Control – SASM and/or</del> Height in Relation to Boundary Control – SASM where it can be demonstrated that the values of the site or area in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori will be protected and maintained, having regard to:  1. Whether any increase in <del>height and/or</del> height in relation to boundary of the building or structure would dominate the site or area, and/or the values of the site or area would be diminished taking	Supports and recognises the importance of appropriately managing development adjacent to these sites to protect and maintain the identified values. In this regard, supports the use of a restrictive HIRB control on adjoining sites. Considers that this tool will satisfactorily apply an appropriate setback from sites with identified values and manage resulting effects. Kāinga Ora opposes the additional height control.

			<p>into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The degree of contrast in scale;</li> <li>b. The degree of any loss of visual connections between sites or areas in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori;</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Values articulated by Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira through an assessment of environmental effects, cultural impact assessment or iwi planning documents; and</li> <li>3. Any alternative methods to avoid or reduce the impact on the values associated with the site or area including through the location, scale, mass, and/or design of the building or structure.</li> </ol>	
FS17.751	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.122	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially



				significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS99.116	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.73	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the deletion of height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori disallowed.	We oppose the deletion of additional height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori because these controls would protect sites of significance from adverse effects of development.
FS127.90	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 7-SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori > 7.5-Rules > 7.5.4-SASM-R4 Any new building or structure, or extension of the footprint of an existing building or structure on a site or area listed in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.11	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports SASM-R4 insofar as new buildings, structures, or extensions are a restricted discretionary activity and considers the matters of discretion, which primarily relate to whether it can be demonstrated that the identified values of the site or area are protected and maintained, do not prohibit the ability to establish fire stations within this zone.
FS17.144	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.15	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend the subdivision policy to encourage subdivision design to achieve efficient water use.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction

				<p>in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
FS17.340	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS32.44	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS74.20	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend SUB- polices to be more explicit about minimising reliance on private cars, and sequencing of all infrastructure including public transport.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>

FS17.345	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.65	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include direction in the Subdivision chapter to provide for de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks) 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 would still be required.	<p>Submitter supports the requirement to connect to reticulated networks where available.</p> <p>However, Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained.</p> <p>Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible.</p> <p>Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes Policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes Policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health.</p>

				<p>These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in brownfield development and greenfield development.</p> <p>Infrastructure is a related provision in the scope of an IPI, under Section 80E(2).</p>
FS17.390	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.49	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	<p>Support the case for de-centralised wastewater re-use in new subdivisions as proposed by the submitter.</p> <p>Submitter is highly cognisant of the fact that the current reticulated infrastructure for wastewater is under pressure in Porirua and that further development is likely to worsen the occurrence of leaks and pollution of the natural waterways.</p>	Allow part 65 of OS74.
OS76.11	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Amendments to provide more design and density flexibility along with the addition of notification preclusion statements.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as</li> </ul>

				<p>to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.679	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.70	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.44	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of

				increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.18	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.22	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Add a policy that enables the development of zero and low carbon and public transport infrastructure (i.e., charging stations, park and ride facilities).	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>



FS17.347	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.48	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the policy.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new policy. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.
OS74.23	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Add a policy that prioritises development where there are public transport links	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.  In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.
FS17.348	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.138	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part and allows in part.  Allow submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, however the RVA's primary position is that retirement villages do not rely on public transport links the same as other residential developments, and therefore the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.3-Objectives > 8.3.2-SUB-O2 Servicing of allotments

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.19	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend SUB-O2 to include all infrastructure (see proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 58)	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>
FS17.344	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.1-SUB-P1 Creation of allotments

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.44	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Te Rūnanga identified a few issues to be addressed with this Chapter. Note that the way	Since Te Rūnanga, when the time comes, will receive lands as part of the Claims Act, in a regime that has been already established by the

			that SUB-P1, SUB-P2 and SUB-P3 worded may disadvantage iwi by taking away the implementation of their self-determination spelled out in our Claims Act as returned land in Porirua.	Crown, Plan Variation and provisions may pose risks around taking advantage of this returned land- and giving further limitations to the way iwi would like to develop and use that land. Because the SUB is drafted in a prescriptive way that the policy repercussions have not been applied or yet tested with how iwi might want to apply their Tino Rangatiratanga; P1, P2, and P3 might be limiting.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.572	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.171	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support the submission points raised by the submitter.	Greater Wellington acknowledge the concerns raised by the submitter and strongly supports relief that will address them.
FS127.435	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.2-SUB-P2 Boundary adjustments

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.45	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Te Rūnanga identified a few issues to be addressed with this Chapter. Note that the way that SUB-P1, SUB-P2 and SUB-P3 worded may disadvantage iwi by taking away the implementation of their self-determination	Since Te Rūnanga, when the time comes, will receive lands as part of the Claims Act, in a regime that has been already established by the Crown, Plan Variation and provisions may pose risks around taking advantage of this returned land- and giving further limitations to the way iwi would like to develop and use that land.

			spelled out in our Claims Act as returned land in Porirua.	Because the SUB is drafted in a prescriptive way that the policy repercussions have not been applied or yet tested with how iwi might want to apply their Tino Rangatiranga; P1, P2, and P3 might be limiting.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.573	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.172	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support the submission points raised by the submitter.	Greater Wellington acknowledge the concerns raised by the submitter and strongly supports relief that will address them.
FS127.436	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.3-SUB-P3 Update of cross-lease titles

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.46	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Te Rūnanga identified a few issues to be addressed with this Chapter. Note that the way that SUB-P1, SUB-P2 and SUB-P3 worded may disadvantage iwi by taking away the implementation of their self-determination spelled out in our Claims Act as returned land in Porirua.	Since Te Rūnanga, when the time comes, will receive lands as part of the Claims Act, in a regime that has been already established by the Crown, Plan Variation and provisions may pose risks around taking advantage of this returned land- and giving further limitations to the way iwi would like to develop and use that land. Because the SUB is drafted in a prescriptive way that the policy repercussions have not been applied or yet tested with how iwi might want to

				apply their Tino Rangatiratanga; P1, P2, and P3 might be limiting.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.574	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.173	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support the submission points raised by the submitter.	Greater Wellington acknowledge the concerns raised by the submitter and strongly supports relief that will address them.
FS127.437	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.4-SUB-P4 Functioning of the transport network

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.47	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	SUB-P4 does not mention Climate Change and emissions reduction. How is Subdivision supposed to contribute to the mitigation of climate change by only enabling and doing more of the same? Especially clause 1, 2 and 4 reflects more of our continued reliance on cars. This needs amendment.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.575	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.174	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Allow whole.	Greater Wellington support amendments that contribute to the mitigation of climate change effects.

FS127.438	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
-----------	---------------	---------	--	---

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.5-SUB-P5 Integration with infrastructure

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.48	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	SUB-P5 poses a significant caveat where infrastructure required for subdivision is integrated and comprehensive. However, the main purpose of this Policy is to make sure that we have the 'infrastructure', and subdivision provisions could give sensible judgements around when this is not the case.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.576	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.439	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.6-SUB-P6 Subdivision in the Residential Zones and Māori Purpose Zone (Hongoeka)

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.87	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Provide for vacant lot subdivision within the Medium Density Residential, <u>General High Density</u> Residential Zone and Māori Purpose Zone (Hongoeka) where it can be demonstrated that the proposed lots are able to accommodate a residential unit that is of a size, scale and location that is anticipated for the Zone.	Notes that no changes are proposed to this provision, but nevertheless seeks changes to this policy to reflect the updated residential zoning framework.
FS17.755	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.120	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.94	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.49	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Separate the Hongoeka Zone (Māori Purpose Zone) from SUB-P6.	There are two zones mentioned in here, that does not necessarily align for the purpose of the SUB-P6.
FS17.577	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.440	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.4-Policies > 8.4.7-SUB-P7 Subdivision in the Future Urban Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.50	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	SUB-P7 is at odds with FUZ chapter and zone. This Policy asks subdivision should be avoided if it results in certain situations and described clauses are already pressing issues for all Porirua.
FS17.578	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.441	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.



## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.1-SUB-R1 Boundary adjustments

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.12	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Boundary adjustments and updating existing cross-lease titles in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. Fire and Emergency strongly support this.</p>
FS17.145	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.88	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the introduction of the non-notification clauses for both public and limited notification.
FS17.756	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.121	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.95	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.2-SUB-R2 Updating of an existing crosslease title

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.13	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	<p>Boundary adjustments and updating existing cross-lease titles in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with</p>

				the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. Fire and Emergency strongly support this.
FS17.146	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.89	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the introduction of the non-notification clauses for both public and limited notification.
FS17.757	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.122	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.96	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	---

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.3-SUB-R3 Subdivision that creates any vacant allotments

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.14	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.  The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this
FS17.147	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.90	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the introduction of the non-notification clauses for both public and limited notification.
FS17.758	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.123	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.97	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.14	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the subdivision provisions in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1048	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.15	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this</p>
FS17.148	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.91	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Introduce non-notification clause for SUB-R4 (1) for both public and limited notification.</p>	Supports the introduction of this Controlled Activity subdivision rule, noting it is generally consistent with clause 7 of Schedule 3A of the Act. However, seeks the introduction of an accompanying non-

				notification clause, to achieve the outcome anticipated by the Act. Notes that while s95A(5)(b) provides for preclusion of Controlled Activity resource consents (both land use and subdivision), s95B(6)(b) does not automatically preclude notification for Controlled Activity subdivision consents.
FS17.759	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.124	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.98	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS81.15	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the subdivision provisions in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1049	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

**8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created > 8.5.4.1-Residential zones 1.  
Activity status: Controlled**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.10	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Seeks the retention of rule SUB-R4 subject to the relief sought in its submission to the PDP on rule SUB-R15 and its inclusion in the IPI.	Supports SUB-R4 on the basis rule SUB-R15 (which is specific to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor) is retained in the PDP (subject to amendments as sought in the submitter's submission to the PDP) and inserted into the IP.
FS17.621	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.



**8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created > 8.5.4.3-All zones All Zones 3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.94	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Supports the introduction of non-notification clauses for both public and limited notification for SUB-R4(3) and SUB-R4(4).	Supports the introduction of non-notification clauses for both public and limited notification for SUB-R4(3) and SUB-R4(4).  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.762	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.127	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.101	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

**8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.4-SUB-R4 Subdivision of land around existing lawfully established buildings (excluding accessory buildings) or buildings (excluding accessory buildings) approved or part of a resource consent application and no vacant allotments are created > 8.5.4.4-All Zones All zones 4. Activity status: Discretionary**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.95	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Supports the introduction of non-notification clauses for both public and	Supports the introduction of non-notification clauses for both public and

			limited notification for SUB-R4(3) and SUB-R4(4).	limited notification for SUB-R4(3) and SUB-R4(4).  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.763	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.128	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.102	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

**8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.10-SUB-R10 Any subdivision within the heritage setting of a heritage item listed in SCHED2 - Historic Heritage Items (Group A) or SCHED3 - Historic Heritage Items (Group B), or a historic heritage site listed in SCHED4 - Historic Heritage Sites**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.16	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	<p>Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this.</p>
FS17.149	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.11-SUB-R11 Any subdivision within a site listed in SCHED6 - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.17	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.  The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this
FS17.150	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.12-SUB-R12 Subdivision of a lot containing a Significant Natural Area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or

				<p>restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this</p>
FS17.151	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.13-SUB-R13 Subdivision within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.20	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified	<p>Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this</p>

FS17.153	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
----------	-----------------	---------	---	---

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.14-SUB-R14 Subdivision of a site containing a Coastal High Natural Character Area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.19	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes that subdivisions in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity.  The matters of control/discretion both include access for firefighting appliances, and the provision of water supply, including for firefighting purposes in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. FENZ strongly support this
FS17.152	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.15-SUB-R15 Subdivision of land to create new allotment(s) within the National Grid Corridor or National Grid Pauatahanui Substation Yard

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.11	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Seeks the inclusion of rule SUB-R15 in the IPI, subject to the relief sought in the submitter's submission to the PDP on rule SUB-R15.	<p>Submitted on the PDP in support of rule SUB-R15 (and specifically the activity status) on the basis the rule gives effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET. Amendments were sought to the rule, but its overall basis was supported.</p> <p>Given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subdivision is the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) are avoided;</li> <li>• The National Grid Subdivision Corridor is referenced in the s32 as a qualifying matter;</li> <li>• Section 771 RMA allows a TA to make the MDRS (which includes subdivision) less enabling of development where necessary to accommodate a QM; and</li> </ul>



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 80E(1)(b)(iii) RMA provides an IPI may amend the MDRS, including in relation to the subdivision of land (s88(2)(g);</li> </ul> <p>Seeks the inclusion of the subdivision rule within the IPI so as to clarify a restricted discretionary activity status applies for subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor.</p>
FS17.622	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.365	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	This rule has been considered already through Hearing Stream 5. Kāinga Ora acknowledges the s42A recommendations regarding this rule within Hearing Stream 5. No further consideration of this rule is considered necessary.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.5-Rules > 8.5.17-SUB-R17 Subdivision adjoining existing Medium Density Residential Zone settlements within the Coastal Environment

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.21	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>2. <u>The ability for fire appliances to access the site</u></p>	Supports SUB-R17 insofar as the subdivision of land adjoining existing Medium Density Residential zone settlements within the coastal environment is a restricted discretionary activity. Notes that SUB-R17 does not require compliance with SUB-S2

			3. <u>The provision of a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509: 2008.</u>	and SUB-S4, which cover fire appliance access and the provision of a firefighting water supply. Considers it important that subdivisions in all areas sufficiently consider these matters to ensure FENZ has the ability to efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies on all sites with the district.
FS17.154	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.6-Standards > 8.6.1-SUB-S1 Minimum allotment size and shape > 8.6.1.1-SUB-Table 1 Minimum allotment size and shape

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.92	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Amend:  Medium Density Residential Zone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>All vacant allotments created must have a minimum allotment size of 300m<sup>2</sup>.</del></li> <li>All vacant allotments must be able to contain a rectangle measuring <del>9m x 14m</del> <u>8m x 15m</u> clear of any yards, access allotments and right-of-way</li> </ul>	Supports this standard applying only to <i>vacant</i> allotments created by subdivision. However, seeks removal of the minimum site area threshold proposed in the MRZ and HRZ. Considers the minimum shape factor is adequate. Also seeks a slight revision to the shape factor to bring a degree of national consistency.

			<p>High Density Residential Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>All vacant allotments created must have a minimum allotment size of 300m<sup>2</sup>.</del></li> <li>• All vacant allotments must be able to contain a rectangle measuring <del>9m x 14m</del> <u>8m x 15m</u></li> </ul>	
FS17.760	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.125	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS122.1	Survey & Spatial New Zealand - Wellington Branch	Support	Submitter requests that the submission to remove the minimum allotment size standards is allowed.	The setting of a minimum allotment size for subdivision in the medium density residential zone and the high density residential zone is not consistent with the NPS-UD.

FS127.99	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.6-Standards > 8.6.5-SUB-S5 Wastewater disposal

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.66	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend wording of clause 2 as follows:</p> <p>Where a connection to Council’s reticulated wastewater systems is not available, all allotments must be provided with on-site wastewater systems <del>a septic tank or</del> <del>soakage field</del> or an approved alternative means to dispose of sewage in a sanitary manner’.</p> <p>Provide for the possibility of de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative approved wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections aren’t available.</p>	<p>The specific reference to septic tanks or soakage fields should be updated to refer to on-site domestic wastewater treatment and disposal.</p> <p>The standard should provide for using approved alternative wastewater systems for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections aren’t available.</p> <p>Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 45 and 16, and from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3, CC.14, 42, FW.5 and 58.</p> <p>Infrastructure is a related provisions in the scope of an IPI, under Section 80E(2).</p>

FS17.391	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.50	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow part 66 of OS74	Support removal of specific reference to septic tanks or soakage fields in regard to on-site wastewater systems.  Badly maintained septic tanks are a known cause of pollution of our streams and harbour. Developments in effective on-site systems go beyond old-style septic tanks and soakage. It makes sense for standards to be described in relation to on-site domestic wastewater treatment and disposal.
FS99.29	Alan Collett	Oppose	Disallow, The reference to septic tanks and effluent soakage systems should remain.	NZ Ministry for the Environment refers to onsite septic tanks and effluent fields as on-site wastewater treatment systems. Law makers need to be aware by restricting alternative solutions under the building act with tighter regulations we can increase the cost of building to the homeowner or developer thereby having a counter effect of trying to deliver affordable housing.

## 8-SUB - Subdivision > 8.6-Standards > 8.6.6-SUB-S6 Stormwater management

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS32.7	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Strongly supports the requirement that any subdivision (the definition of which includes unit titles) in any of the zones must achieve hydraulic neutrality. This is a critically important provision.
FS17.61	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.458	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS68.3	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Strongly supports that any subdivision (the definition of which includes unit titles) in any of the zones must achieve hydraulic neutrality. This is a critically important provision.</p> <p>Strongly support GOPI/ PHAACT points made for each residential zone re site coverage and hydraulic neutrality. We also note the lack of site coverage statement for the High Density Zone and support the notion that a requirement of no more than 80% should be imposed, with the stated implications for precinct design.</p>
FS17.284	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.481	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 9-NOISE - Noise

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS72.9	KiwiRail	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports the inclusion of acoustic and vibration standards, and district-wide building setbacks as important controls to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor, particularly where intensive residential development is proposed adjacent to the rail corridor. Previously submitted on these provisions (seeking their retention with amendment) through the wider Proposed District Plan process.
FS17.306	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.376	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Inconsistent with primary submission and evidence in HS4.

## 9-NOISE - Noise > 9.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add new objective:  <i><u>NOISE-OX Where the locational, functional or operational needs are such that activities of importance to the community could not otherwise meet noise and vibration standards, enable these activities by allowing a whole or partial exemption, or relaxation, from those noise standards.</u></i>	Notes that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.  Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens.  In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the

				<p>District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments, within reasonable limits.</p> <p>It is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3). . Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of FENZ and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>Seeks addition of objectives and policy framework ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet FENZ statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>
FS17.155	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.23	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add policy:</p> <p><u><i>NOISE-PX To allow a marginal relaxation of noise standards, but not exceeding National Standards, where the noise generating activity is of</i></u></p>	<p>Notes that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.</p> <p>Noise will be produced on site by</p>



			<p><u>importance to the safety of the community, such as the operation of emergency services.</u></p>	<p>operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens.</p> <p>In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments, within reasonable limits.</p> <p>It is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3). . Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of FENZ and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>Seeks addition of objectives and policy framework ensure that emergency service operations are enabled to meet FENZ statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities. [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>
--	--	--	---	---

FS17.156	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.24	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add policy:</p> <p><u><i>NOISE-PX To allow noisy activities of limited duration and frequency which are of importance to the community, such as noise associated with the operation of emergency services and temporary military training activities, subject to appropriate controls.</i></u></p>	<p>Notes that due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within the urban and rural environment.</p> <p>Noise will be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens.</p> <p>In order to ensure that fire stations and associated training activities can take place in residential areas in compliance with the District Plan, it is necessary that a new or amended rule makes an allowance for such essential activities within both urban and rural environments, within reasonable limits.</p> <p>It is not possible for emergency sirens to comply with NZS 6802:2008 (Table 3). . Allowing noise associated with the operation of emergency services provides for the operational requirements of FENZ and enables it to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the ongoing health and safety of people and communities.</p> <p>Seeks addition of objectives and policy framework ensure that emergency service</p>

				operations are enabled to meet FENZ statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities. [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]
FS17.157	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.25	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add new rule:</p> <p><b><u><i>NOISE -RX Noise from Emergency Services Facilities and Temporary Emergency Services Training Activities (All zones)</i></u></b></p> <p>1. <u><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Where:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>The noise source is a warning device or siren (including their routine testing and maintenance) associated with an Emergency Service Activity or Temporary Emergency Services Training Activity when measured within the site boundary of a receiving site, or within the notional boundary of rural dwellings or habitable buildings.</i></u></p>	For the reasons outlined in the previous point, seeks the inclusion of a new rule that permits noise from emergency service facilities and temporary emergency services training activities in all zones.
FS17.158	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 9-NOISE - Noise > 9.5-Rules > 9.5.4-NOISE-R4 New buildings, change of use of existing buildings, and additions to existing buildings over 50m2, for use as residential units, supported residential care activities, retirement village or visitor accommodation in Commercial and Mixed Use and Industrial Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS78.2	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support	Support	<p>Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.</p> <p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near</p>

				<p>the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG), the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p> <p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.</p>
FS17.1028	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS118.58	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend NOISE-R4 to integrate consideration of noise matters on a case-by-case basis for retirement villages in Commercial and Mixed Use and Industrial Zones.	The standards referred to in NOISE-R4 should be amended to integrate consideration of noise matters on a case-by-case basis for retirement villages in Commercial and Mixed Use and Industrial Zones.
FS67.60	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 9-NOISE - Noise > 9.6-Standards > 9.6.5-NOISE-S5 Residential units, supported residential care activities, retirement village and visitor accommodation - Indoor noise design levels

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS78.3	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support	Support	Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.

				<p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG), the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p> <p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

FS17.1029	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS118.59	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend NOISE-S5 to integrate consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances.	Acknowledges that indoor noise design levels need to be of a sufficient standard for retirement village residents. Such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to individual site characteristics and environments.
FS67.61	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 9-NOISE - Noise > 9.6-Standards > 9.6.6-NOISE-S6 Residential units, supported residential care activity, retirement village and visitor accommodation - Mechanical ventilation

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS78.4	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support	Support	Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several

				<p>amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.</p> <p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG), the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.
FS17.1030	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS118.60	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend NOISE-S6 to integrate consideration of individual site characteristics / circumstances.	Acknowledges that indoor noise design levels need to be of a sufficient standard for retirement village residents. Such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to individual site characteristics and environments.
FS67.62	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS68.2	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Not Stated	Another objective be added:  RES 04 A Sustainable and Healthy Environment The intensity, form and design of use and development in Residential Zones sustains a healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health	Concerned by the lack of any reference to objectives or policies for the protection or enhancement of natural resources.

			and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.	
FS17.283	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.480	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS85.1	Metlifecare Limited	Amend	The objectives and policies for all residential zones should recognise the benefits of retirement village development and their functional and operational needs .	<p>The Variation includes a retirement village specific policy in the General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones chapter (RESZ-P13). This is carried over from the Medium Density Residential zone provisions in the Proposed District Plan without amendment (previously MRZ-P6).</p> <p>However, amendments are required to recognise anticipated development within residential areas and the intensification which is required under the Amendment Act and NPS-UD. In addition, as retirement villages have particular functional and operational needs which drive their built form it is appropriate to recognise and provide for this in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>As currently drafted:</p> <p>(a) RESZ-P13 imposes an unnecessarily high burden to avoid significant adverse effects. This is inconsistent with the effects hierarchy which allows for the remediation and mitigation of these effects in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>(b) RESZ-P13 does not recognise the</p>

				<p>functional and operational needs of retirement villages to ensure that the particular needs of this type of development are recognised and enabled in this zone. Retirement villages have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p>(c) the Variation appears to remove MRZ-P11 from the Proposed Plan without justification. It previously read: “recognise the functional and operational requirements of retirement villages and non-residential activities that support the health and wellbeing of people and communities”.</p> <p>(d) the Variation does not recognise the community benefits from the provision of retirement villages. For example, retirement villages release pressure on social and health services and contribute to employment in New Zealand, both in the construction sector and day-to-day operations. As explained above, they also have a crucial role in the general housing market because the supply of retirement village housing releases existing housing stock back into the market. Importantly, they also provide housing choice for the older population in an environment that supports well-being and is located within the community that they know.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice.
FS17.438	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.150	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part.  Allow relief sought by Metlifecare in relation to MRZ-P11, subject to the relief sought in the RVA primary submission.	The RVA supports in part this submission point, as MRZ-P11 recognised the functional and operational requirements of retirement villages and the policy appears to have been removed without justification.
OS118.37	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	The objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan must enable appropriate accommodation and care for the aging population as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An objective to provide for the housing and care needs of the ageing population;</li> <li>• A policy that recognises the need for change over time to the existing character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the</li> </ul>	The rapidly aging population is a significant resource management issue. RESZ-P13 and MRZ-P6 are not sufficiently enabling of retirement villages as the provision for retirement villages is qualified by a number of matters. The policy does not recognise and provide for the benefits of retirement villages and their functional and operational needs. Additional objectives and policies are also required.



			<p>diverse and changing needs of the community;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy that recognises the need to provide for a range of housing and care options for older people and to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages;</li> <li>• A policy to enable the efficient use of larger sites;</li> <li>• A policy that directs that density standards are to be used as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</li> </ul>	
FS67.39	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.12	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>Amend RESZ as follows:</p> <p><b><i>RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones Introduction</i></b></p> <p>.....</p> <p><u><i>There are parts of the Residential Zones where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPSUD may be</i></u></p>	<p>Supports the introductory text to the RESZ chapter. The text could benefit from additional wording to highlight to plan users the existence of other qualifying matters. As currently drafted, the wording infers the only qualifying matters that apply to the RESZ are those in respect to Height Controls – Shading, and Height Control – Heritage,</p>

			<p><u>modified and/or limited by qualifying matters and qualifying matter areas.</u></p> <p><i>There are also areas that have lower height limits for buildings and structures because of their slope aspect or topographical constraints. In these areas, additional control is necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of taller buildings on the health and well-being of people and communities. They are qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA. These areas are identified on the planning map layer as Height Controls – Shading. They represent areas that are generally suited to a medium density intensity of development, but which have steep southern slope aspects or a complex topography that means the adverse effects of taller buildings need additional control.</i></p> <p>.....</p>	HIRB Control – Heritage, Height Control – SASM, and HIRB Control – SASM.
FS17.623	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.13	KiwiRail	Support	Adopt amendment sought in submission.	KiwiRail agrees that the wording of the introductory text should clearly recognise that there are a range of qualifying matters that can affect the intensity of development.
FS73.20	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Accept the submission.	Support additional wording to explain that there are areas in Residential Zones that are subject to qualifying matters. This would assist with clarity for plan users.
OS70.8	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	A general policy needs to be added that covers Qualifying Matters that prevent	The Government's decision to remove Council's ability to require off-street parking

			<p>developments with inadequate off-street parking, where safe alternative parking is not available.</p>	<p>in building developments will result in increased parking issues the PCC will be unable to overcome.</p> <p>Some Developers will take the opportunity to maximise accommodation at the expense of off-street parking. This is already happening.</p> <p>Many side roads in the northern suburbs are winding and too narrow to allow safe parking on the road. The Mana Esplanade area has almost no 24-hour parking available on the roadside.</p> <p>Allowing Developers to create a parking problem without restraint is not acceptable. Qualifying Matters need to be applied that prevent developments with inadequate off-street parking where safe roadside or alternative parking is not available.</p>
FS17.297	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.12	Radio New Zealand Limited	Amend	Insert additional text to reference RNZ's proposed qualifying matter for Radiocommunication Transmission and to recognise that additional controls are necessary to mitigate the adverse effects resulting from taller buildings in close proximity to RNZ's transmission infrastructure.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

FS17.321	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.381	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter and resulting change to these provisions
OS76.93	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><u>Amend Introduction Paragraph 2:</u></p> <p>The Residential Zones provide for a range of densities and built forms and recognise that residential activities encompass a wide range of housing and living arrangements. This includes social and community housing and multi-generational living, as well as traditional family housing. They do not promote one form of housing over another but instead provide flexibility to meet the community's diverse housing preferences and needs. <u>It is anticipated that the urban built form, appearance, and amenity of residential environments within the Residential Zones will change over time, in accordance with the planned urban built form of each zone and precinct.</u></p>	Generally supports the proposed new RESZ chapter but seeks amendments to the introduction. Consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD, seeks explicit reference be made to the anticipated change to the planned urban built form, appearance, and amenity within the residential zones.
FS17.761	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.126	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.174	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Allow amendment sought by Kāinga Ora on this submission point, along with the RVA's primary submission points.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it is consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, and the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.100	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.96	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Delete Introduction paragraph 4:  <del>There are also areas that have lower height limits for buildings and structures because of their slope aspect or topographical constraints. In these areas, additional control is necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of taller buildings on the health and well-being of people and communities. They are qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA. These areas are identified on the planning map layer as Height Controls – Shading. They represent</del>	Opposes the introduction of the Qualifying Matter on sites with a steep south facing profile and the related height control. Deletion of reference to this is sought. Also seeks consequential changes throughout the Variation planning maps and provisions to delete reference to "Height Controls – Shading".

			<p>areas that are generally suited to a medium density intensity of development, but which have steep southern slope aspects or a complex topography that means the adverse effects of taller buildings need additional control.</p>	
FS17.764	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.86	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow all part 96 of OS76	<p>Oppose removal of Introduction para 4 to the RESZ-General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones&gt;General.</p> <p>Taking account of slope aspect and topographical constraints is vital to mitigate the adverse effects of taller buildings on health and wellbeing. They are qualifying matters under s771 of the RMA. Kāinga Ora, in its pursuit of maximum flexibility for intensive development, is seeking to remove very sensible provisions for controls over difficult sites.</p>
FS99.129	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood</p>

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.103	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.4	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	<p>Another objective be added as RES-O4:</p> <p><b><u>RES-O4: A Sustainable and Healthy Environment</u></b></p> <p><u>The intensity, form and design of use and development in Residential Zones sustains a healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u></p>	<p>No reference in these objectives and policies to protecting or enhancing natural resources and especially fresh and marine water ecosystems. This is in stark contrast to provisions in the Northern Growth Area. The only indirect reference is to amenity values in RESZ O2, plus the mention in RESZ P2 of limiting development where it (presumably adversely) affects Māori and their culture and traditions, including water.</p> <p>These [proposed RES O4] words are copied from DEV NG O2 - proposals for the Northern Growth Area. [These are the] most appropriate and relevant. They must</p>

				be adopted as a requirement for all development in the city.
FS17.58	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.127	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
FS127.455	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS73.13	Radio New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>New Policy</p> <p>RESZ-PX Height Control – Radiocommunication Transmission</p> <p><u>On sites identified on the planning maps as being subject to Height Control – Radiocommunication Transmission, limit the height of buildings and structures to 10 metres unless, on consultation with Radio New Zealand, it can be demonstrated that:</u></p> <p><u>1. The building or structure is located 528 metres or more from Radio New Zealand's radiocommunication Facilities ;and</u></p> <p><u>2. The building or structure is constructed of materials that comply with electromagnetic radiation standards.”</u></p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.322	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.



FS76.382	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter and resulting change to these provisions
OS85.3	Metlifecare Limited	Amend	<u>RESZ-P[x]: "Recognise the functional and operational requirements of retirement villages and non-residential activities that support the health and wellbeing of people and communities"</u>	<p>The Variation appears to remove MRZ-P11 from the Proposed Plan without justification. It previously read: "recognise the functional and operational requirements of retirement villages and non-residential activities that support the health and wellbeing of people and communities".</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.440	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.64	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that a new Objective is inserted that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	In addition to the current general objectives for all residential zones an ageing population specific objective should be integrated that recognises and enables the

			<b><u>RESZ-OX Ageing population</u></b> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>	housing and care needs of the ageing population.
FS67.66	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.75	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that a new policy is inserted that recognises the intensification opportunities provided for by larger sites.  <b><u>RESZ-PX Larger sites</u></b> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>	A policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites should be integrated into the District Plan.
FS67.77	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.76	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that a new Policy is inserted that recognises the diverse and changing community needs and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time.  <b><u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u></b> <u>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 variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	A policy is required that recognises the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.
FS67.78	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

OS118.77	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks a new policy that enables the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.  <b><u>RESZ-PX Role of density standards</u></b> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	It is appropriate for the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments as noted in the submission above.
FS67.79	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.3-Objectives > 10.3.1-RESZ-O1 Housing Choice

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.2	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Amend	Amend Objective RESZ-O1 as follows:  RESZ-O1 Housing Choice  A relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types, <u>households</u> , and sizes that respond to:  1. Housing needs and demand; and  2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.	Submitter requests objective RESZ-O1 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community's diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in residential zones, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support.  This includes residential activities provided by Ara Poutama that provide housing and associated care and support for people following their release, to assist with their transition and integration back into the

				<p>community; and housing for those on bail or community-based sentences.</p> <p>Providing for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
OS76.98	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports objective and notes it is mandated by the RMA.
FS17.766	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.131	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.105	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.16	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of this objective in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1050	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.49	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS118.61	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-O1 as notified.	Supports RESZ-O1 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.
FS67.63	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.3-Objectives > 10.3.2-RESZ-O2 Purpose of Residential Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.27	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports RESZ-O2 insofar as it promotes the accommodation of other activities within the residential zone where they support the safety of people and communities.

FS17.160	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.99	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p>Residential zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Primarily consist of residential activities;</li> <li>2. <u>Provide for a range of built form and housing types, with higher densities enabled in areas that are well served by public transport or are close to a range of services, amenities, schools, and public open space;</u> and</li> <li>3. <u>3.</u> Accommodate other activities that support the health and wellbeing of people and communities, where these are compatible with the planned urban built environment and amenity values of the zone.</li> </ol>	Generally supports this objective but seeks greater recognition in the overarching residential chapter regarding the changing density and urban built form and where higher densities are specifically enabled.
FS17.767	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS81.44	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Allow	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed amendments to RESZ02 as it recognises that higher densities will be enabled when located in close proximity to public transport. This supports a well-functioning urban environment.

FS99.132	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.181	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Allow amendment sought by Kāinga Ora on this submission point, along with associated requests within the RVA's primary submission.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
FS127.106	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.62	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-O2 as notified and provide retirement village specific policies as requested [in separate submission points].	Supports RESZ-O2 and its provision for primarily residential activities in the residential zones, subject to recognition that retirement villages are residential activities.
FS67.64	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.3-Objectives > 10.3.3-RESZ-O3 Sustainable, healthy and safe residential zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.13	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective RESZ-O3	Supports Objective RESZ-O3 in that it recognises safe living environments. The management of activities within proximity of the National Grid gives effect to the objective in providing safe environments.
FS17.624	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS58.28	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports RESZ-O3 insofar as it promotes the efficient and sustainable use of infrastructure to create safe residential environments.
FS17.161	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.100	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports objective.
FS17.768	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.133	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has



			proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.107	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.63	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amend RESZ-O3 so that its focus is solely on the efficient use and development of residentially zoned land.	Supports the concept of "efficient use of residential land". Larger sites can accommodate greater density development. It is not however clear what "sustainable use of residential land" is intended to capture. The objective seeks for development which is consistent with the planned urban built environment for the zone or precinct whereas Objective RSZ-O1 seeks development that responds to a neighbourhood's planned urban built character. These two objectives conflict with each other and create unclear expectations with respect to the planned urban built environment / character. Similar to UFD-O6 above, the reference to "a

				healthy and safe built environment” is unclear.
FS67.65	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.41	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	It is encouraging to see RESZ-P9 height Variation Control – Qualifying Matters. This means when the SASM schedule is finally given effect with the Plan Change, the heights would be able to be controlled. A clause should be added to clarify this.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.569	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.432	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.42	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Not Stated	RESZ-P16 does not spell out the ‘Effects on Sites and Areas of Significance’ – Qualifying matters.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.570	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.433	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

# 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.1-RESZ-P1 Residential activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.3	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Amend	Amend Objective RESZ-O1 as follows:  RESZ-P1 Residential Activity  Enable a variety of housing types <u>and</u> <u>households</u> with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.	<p>Submitter requests policy RESZ-P1 is retained but amended so that a variety of household types that meet the community's diverse social and economic housing needs are provided for in residential zones, including households that involve an element of supervision, assistance, care and/or treatment support.</p> <p>This includes residential activities provided by Ara Poutama that provide housing, and associated care and support for people following their release, to assist with their transition and integration back into the community; and housing for those on bail or community-based sentences.</p> <p>Providing for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones is important to meet community needs, build strong and resilient communities, and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>

OS53.14	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Amend	Amend RESZ-P1 as follows:  <b>RESZ-P1 Residential activity</b> <i>Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments, while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</i>	Within the Medium Density Residential Zone existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within MRZ-P1 is supported (and reflects Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the RMA), supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development. While RESZ-P2 references qualifying matters, it does not refer to appropriateness.
FS17.625	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.14	KiwiRail	Support	Adopt amendment sought in submission.	KiwiRail agrees that it is appropriate for reference to qualifying matters be included in the policy areas as these inform both the degree of density but also the appropriateness of certain locations for higher density development.
FS73.21	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Accept the submission.	Support strong policy direction to recognise the importance of qualifying matters and the fact that they may justify lower height and density limits.
FS76.366	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment to RESZ-P1 as it does not support the introduction of "qualifying matter areas". Further, Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of the word "avoiding" within the proposed amendment.

OS76.101	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this provision, noting it is mandatory under the Act.
FS17.769	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.134	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.108	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.17	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1051	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS72.50	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS118.65	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-P1 as notified.	Supports RESZ-P1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.
FS67.67	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.2-RESZ-P2 Medium Density Residential Standards

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.15	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain RESZ-P2	Supports RESZ-P2 (noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the RMA) in that it recognises qualifying matters.
FS17.626	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.102	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this provision, noting it is mandatory under the Act.
FS17.770	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.135	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.109	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.18	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1052	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.51	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS118.66	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-P2 as notified.	Supports RESZ-P2 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.
FS67.68	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.3-RESZ-P3 Safety and street scene quality

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.103	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this provision, noting it is mandatory under the Act.
FS17.771	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.136	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.110	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been



				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.19	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1053	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.52	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS118.67	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-P3 as notified.	Supports RESZ-P3 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.
FS67.69	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.4-RESZ-P4 Health and well-being

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.104	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this provision, noting it is mandatory under the Act.
FS17.772	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.137	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has

			proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.111	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.20	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1054	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.53	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS118.68	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-P4 as notified.	Supports RESZ-P4 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.
FS67.70	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

# 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.5-RESZ-P5 Buildings and structures

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.5	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	<p>RESZ P5 be amended to read:</p> <p><b><i>Buildings and Structures</i></b></p> <p><i>Enable buildings and structures:</i></p> <p><i>1. That meet the health and well-being needs of people and communities; and</i></p> <p><i>2. Are of an intensity, form, scale and design that achieve the planned urban built form for the zone or precinct they are in; and</i></p> <p><i>3. <u>Minimise adverse effects on natural resources including:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i><u>The effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</u></i></li> <li>• <i><u>The risks of excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</u></i></li> <li>• <i><u>The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</u></i></li> </ul>	<p>No reference in these objectives and policies to protecting or enhancing natural resources and especially fresh and marine water ecosystems. This is in stark contrast to provisions in the Northern Growth Area. The only indirect reference is to amenity values in RESZ O2, plus the mention in RESZ P2 of limiting development where it (presumably adversely) affects Māori and their culture and traditions, including water.</p>

FS17.59	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.456	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.105	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Enable buildings and structures:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That meet the <u>health amenity</u> and well-being needs of people and communities; and</li> <li>2. Are of an intensity, form, scale and design that achieve the planned urban built form for the zone or precinct they are located in</li> </ol>	Generally supports this policy but seeks amendment to reflect the outcome being sought is one of amenity and well-being in the context of a changing urban environment.
FS17.773	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.88	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow all part 105 of OS76	Health and well-being trumps amenity, therefore oppose the submitter's request to amend the RESZ-P5 statement to replace the word "health" with "amenity".  The PCC proposal better articulates the needs of people in the Porirua community.
FS72.24	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject submission and retain reference to health instead of amenity or include reference to amenity in addition to reference to health.	It is critical that buildings and structures meet the health needs of communities in addition to amenity and well-being. As Kainga Ora recognises in its submission, amenity values can change over time and therefore can be difficult quantify compared to health needs. The provisions

				as notified provide a clearer standard to be achieved by retaining reference to health. In the event amenity is included, reference to health should also be referenced.
FS81.45	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	Disallow	Waka Kotahi does not support the replacement of the term “health” with “amenity” within RESZ-P5. Objective 1 of the National Policy Statement- Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD) provides for a “well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their health and safety, now and into the future.” Waka Kotahi considers that the inclusion of the term “health” within RESZ-P5 reflects Objective 1 of the NPS-UD. In addition to the above, noise effects can interrupt amenity and enjoyment, as well as the ability to sleep which can have significant impacts on people’s health and wellbeing. Waka Kotahi considers that RESZ-P5 puts emphasis on requiring buildings and structures to meet the health and well-being needs of people, to ensure matters such as noise, does not adversely affect their health.
FS99.138	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.112	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.21	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1055	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.54	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS118.69	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Delete RESZ-P5.	RESZ-P5 is opposed as it conflicts with Objective RESZ-O1, which seeks development which responds to the neighbourhood's planned urban built character – whereas this policy seeks that development 'achieves' the planned urban built form for the zone. These expectations are different and considered to conflict / contrast with each other, and consequently Policy RESZ-P5 should be deleted. Health and wellbeing needs are already covered by RESZ-P4 and do not need to be addressed in this policy.

FS67.71	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
---------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.6-RESZ-P6 Providing for development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.106	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this provision, noting it is mandatory under the Act.
FS17.774	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.139	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.113	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.39	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Te Rūnanga will be keen to understand the rationale for this to be introduced that the plan in general is enabling housing at every level, form, and function.	It is unclear why there was need for RESZ-P6 <i>Providing for development</i> that does not meet permitted activity status.
FS17.567	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.430	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.70	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain RESZ-P6 as notified.	Supports RESZ-P6 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.
FS67.72	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.7-RESZ-P7 Health and well-being - Development not meeting permitted activity standards

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------



OS76.107	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><b>RESZ-P7</b></p> <p><b>Health Amenity and well-being – Development not meeting permitted activity standards</b></p> <p>Provide for <del>buildings and structures</del> <u>built form</u> that <del>does</del> not meet the permitted activity standards where it can be demonstrated, as relevant and having regard to the planned urban built environment for the zone or precinct, that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. The separation from site boundaries and heights in respect to site boundaries, safeguards on-site and off-site privacy, mitigates visual dominance to adjacent sites, and ensures adequate access to sunlight and daylight;</del></li> <li>1. There is a reasonable standard of visual privacy between habitable rooms of different buildings, on the same or adjacent sites;</li> <li>2. Appropriate levels of useable outdoor amenity space for residential units is provided that can readily accommodate outdoor activities, taking into account proximity of the site to public open space;</li> </ol>	<p>Generally supports this policy but seeks amendment to simplify the arms and assessment matters within the policy.</p> <p>Does not support the use of the term “safeguard” in the context of provision of privacy. It is agreed that privacy is an important amenity to provide for, the use of the term “safeguard” within the policy however creates an expectation that privacy levels will be maintained. Policy 6 of the NPS-UD is clear that amenity levels will change through a changing urban built form.</p>
----------	------------------------------------	-------	--	--

			<p>3. <del>Visual dominance, shading and loss of privacy for adjacent residential sites from over height buildings is mitigated or remedied; and</del></p> <p>3. <u>Built form that does not comply with the height in relation to boundary, building set back, site coverage or height standards is mitigated or remedied through either design responses to the built development, landscaping, or site specific factors, ensuring adequate provision of privacy and access to sunlight is made to neighbouring residential properties internal and external living areas, and the impact of building bulk and dominance on neighbouring residential properties is reduced; and</u></p> <p>4. Topographical or other site constraints make compliance with a density standard impractical.</p>	
FS17.775	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.25	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject amendment sought in submission to the extent that it is inconsistent with the relief sought in KiwiRail's primary submission.	It is critical that buildings and structures meet the health needs of communities in addition to amenity and well-being. As Kainga Ora recognises in its submission, amenity values can change over time and therefore can be difficult to quantify compared to health needs. The provisions as notified provide a clearer standard to be achieved by retaining reference to health.

				In the event amenity is included, reference to health should also be referenced. To the extent non-compliance with building setbacks are being expressly provided for in this policy, it also needs to recognize the specific matters of non-compliance relating to qualifying matters that also control those building setbacks, including the rail corridor.
FS99.140	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.114	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.40	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	RESZ-P7 comes across as a further enabling tool; it is concerning that the

				drafting reads as any proposal can go through the process as long as these standards are met/ demonstrated regardless of how they interact with environment and how the proposal may impact the greater system.
FS17.568	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.431	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.71	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Delete RESZ-P7.	Oppose RESZ-P7 as it conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage residential development beyond the permitted activity standards in a manner beyond just considering the effects of the breach of the standards and whether development is high quality. For example, (1) requires on-site and off-site privacy to be 'safeguarded' which is not reasonable given the density of development anticipated by the MDRS. Further, (5) introduces a test of whether compliance with standards is 'impractical' which should not be required to justify breaches of the standards. There is also significant overlap between P7 and P8 that is likely to lead to interpretation issues.
FS67.73	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.8-RESZ-P8 Urban built environment - Development not meeting permitted activity standards

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.16	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain RESZ-P8	Largely supportive of RESZ-P8 on the basis the policy is specific to the permitted activity standards within MRZ-ZR1.
FS17.627	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.108	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports policy.
FS17.776	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.141	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.115	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.72	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Delete RESZ-P8.	Opposes RESZ-P8 as it conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage residential development beyond the permitted activity standards in a manner beyond just considering the effects of the breach of the standards and whether development is high quality. In particular, (6) and (7) require non-compliance with standards to be justified in relation to both natural hazard mitigation and impracticality of compliance. There is also significant overlap between P7 and P8 that is likely to lead to interpretation issues.
FS67.74	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.9-RESZ-P9 Height Control - Shading

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS76.109	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p>On sites identified on the planning maps as being subject to Height Control – Shading, limit the height of buildings and structures where these would result in <u>adverse shading effects on the Mungavin netball courts facility</u>:-</p> <p>1. <u>Loss of sunlight to adjacent residential sites; or</u></p> <p><u>Adverse shading effects on the Mungavin netball courts facility</u>.</p>	Opposes the introduction of a Qualifying Matter specific to shading effects on residential sites with a steep south facing profile. All provisions and rules relating to this proposed qualifying matter are sought to be deleted.
FS17.777	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.115	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.142	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.116	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.10-RESZ-P10 Urban built environment - Development not meeting permitted activity standard for number of residential units on a site

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.111	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p><del>Provide for more than three residential units on a site where it can be demonstrated that the development is consistent with the Residential Design</del></p>	Supports the policy's intent to achieve high quality design outcomes but opposed to design guides being incorporated as statutory elements of the District Plan. Also opposed to any directive within policies or matters of discretion that require a proposal to be <i>consistent</i> with the design



		<p><u>Guide as contained in APP3—Residential Design Guide.</u></p> <p><u>Provide for residential intensification of a site where it can be demonstrated that the development achieves positive design outcomes and living environments, taking into consideration the following design objectives as relevant to the specific site, development type, and the planned urban built environment of the zone:</u></p> <p><u><i>Built form:</i></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Optimise the quality of the built form outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach to the site.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Achieve a positive frontage to the street.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Achieve visual interest while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Achieve driveways, manoeuvring and parking areas that are safe, convenient, and attractive.</u></li> </ol> <p><u><i>Amenity and well-being</i></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. <u>Integrate building form and open space design to achieve high</u></li> </ol>	<p>guide. Seeks changes so that the policy articulates the outcomes being sought.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p><u>internal amenity and form well-located and usable private open spaces.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. <u>Achieve reasonable sunlight, daylight, and outlook.</u></li> <li>7. <u>Provide reasonable internal visual privacy for all units within a development.</u></li> <li>8. <u>Ensure outdoor living areas are well-located, functional for the intended use, and high quality.</u></li> <li>9. <u>Achieve visual amenity, safety, and functionality with planting.</u></li> <li>10. <u>Achieve high quality, legible and efficient circulation.</u></li> <li>11. <u>Provide for servicing that is suitably generous, convenient, and visually discreet.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.779	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.144	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.182	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (amendments to RESZ-P10) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.118	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.73	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Seeks amendment to RESZ-P10 so that it does not apply to retirement villages. A retirement village-specific policy [separate submission point] will encourage high quality retirement village development.	RESZ-P10 provides for the development of more than three residential units 'where it can be demonstrated that the development is consistent with the Residential Design Guide'. Opposes RESZ-P10 as the Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and provides no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs). Retirement villages can be 'high quality' (in line with Policy 5 of the MDRS and RESZ-P6)

				without being consistent with the Residential Design Guide.
FS67.75	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.11-RESZ-P11 Non-residential activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.29	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports RESZ-P11 insofar as it provides for emergency service facilities locating in the residential zones where there is a operational or functional need to locate in the zone.
FS17.162	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.112	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Provide for non-residential activities that contribute to the <u>health amenity</u> and wellbeing of people and communities where:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>They support the needs of local communities;</u></li> <li>These are <u>of an intensity, scale and design that is</u> compatible with the planned urban built environment and amenity of the area;</li> </ol>	Generally supports this policy but seeks some amendments to articulate the outcomes more clearly.

			<p>3. <u>They contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets;</u></p> <p>4. <u>Any adverse effects on the amenity values of adjoining sites can be adequately mitigated, including from the location and scale of utility and external storage areas;</u></p> <p>5. <u>These do not result in adverse effects on the amenity values of adjoining sites from the movement of people and vehicles associated with the activity which cannot be mitigated;</u></p> <p>4. The hours of operation are compatible with residential amenity values; and</p> <p>5. For Emergency Service Facilities, the activity has an operational need or functional need to locate in the zone</p>	
FS17.780	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.145	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.119	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS92.6	Ministry of Education	Amend	RESZ- P11- Non-residential activities  Provide for non-residential activities that contribute to the health and wellbeing of people and communities where:  (...)  6. <u>They can ensure that the needs of the community can be met by supporting the development capacity of educational facilities.</u>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

# 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.12-RESZ-P12 Commercial activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.113	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Delete:  <del>Only allow commercial activities where they are ancillary to a residential activity and of a scale where significant adverse effects are avoided, and any other adverse effects are appropriately remedied or mitigated.</del>	Seeks the deletion of this policy, as any such activities can be appropriately considered against RESZ-P11 (regardless of whether the activity is a RDIS or DIS), and other NC activities are also assessed against RESZ-P14. RESZ-P12 is considered unnecessary.  Furthermore, Kāinga Ora is seeking a new rule to provide a RDIS pathway for commercial activities to locate on the ground floor of apartment buildings in the HRZ chapter, which would not be required to be ancillary to a residential activity.
FS17.781	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.146	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.120	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.13-RESZ-P13 Retirement villages

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.114	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy.
FS17.782	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.147	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude



				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.121	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS85.2	Metlifecare Limited	Not Stated	<p>Amend:</p> <p>RESZ-P13:</p> <p><u>Recognise the benefits of, and provide for retirement villages where:</u></p> <p>(a) Significant adverse effects on the residential amenity values of adjoining residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood <u>can be are</u> avoided, <u>remedied or mitigated;</u></p> <p>(b) Other adverse effects on residential amenity values are minimised, including those from:</p> <p>(i) The movement of vehicles and people; and</p>	As currently drafted RESZ-P13 imposes an unnecessarily high burden to avoid significant adverse effects. This is inconsistent with the effects hierarchy which allows for the remediation and mitigation of these effects in appropriate circumstances. RESZ-P13 does not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to ensure that the particular needs of this type of development are recognised and enabled in this zone. Retirement villages have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age. The Variation does not recognise the community benefits from the provision of retirement villages. For example, retirement villages release pressure on social and health services and contribute to employment in New Zealand, both in the construction sector and day-today

			<p>(ii) <u>The layout of buildings, fencing and the</u> location and scale of utility areas and external storage areas;</p> <p>(c) On-site amenity, including outdoor living space, for residents is provided, which reflects the nature of and diverse needs of residents of the village;</p> <p>(d) The site can accommodate the scale and intensity of the activity, in terms of its size, topography and location; and</p> <p>(e) The overall <del>scale</del>, form, composition, and design of buildings does not compromise the planned urban built form of the zone or precinct they are located in, <u>while recognising that retirement villages may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p>	<p>operations. As explained above, they also have a crucial role in the general housing market because the supply of retirement village housing releases existing housing stock back into the market. Importantly, they also provide housing choice for the older population in an environment that supports well-being and is located within the community that they know.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.439	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.74	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that RESZ-P13 is amended as follows to integrate acknowledgement of the diverse housing and care options of	Supports the provision of a retirement village specific policy in the General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones chapter of the District Plan. RESZ-P13 must give effect to the direction under the

		<p>retirement villages, and their unique functional and operational needs:</p> <p><b><u>RESZ-P13 Retirement villages</u></b></p> <p><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 [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p>Provide for retirement villages where:</p> <p><del>1. Significant adverse effects on the residential amenity values of adjoining residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood are avoided, remedied or mitigated;</del></p> <p><del>2. Other adverse effects on residential amenity values are minimised, including those from:</del></p> <p><del>a. The movement of vehicles and people; and</del></p> <p><del>b. The layout of buildings, fencing, location and scale of utility areas and external storage areas;</del></p> <p><del>3. On-site amenity, including outdoor living</del></p>	<p>NPSUD that acknowledges amenity values evolve over time, and that expectations for existing amenity must also evolve in order to enable necessary housing. Changes to amenity values are not of themselves an adverse effect. RES-P13 must recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, which result in building formats that tend to be higher intensity than surrounding residential neighbourhoods. Opposes a policy requirement relating to on-site amenity. Significant experience of building villages and know intimately the amenity needs of its residents. Frequently come across issues during consenting processes where council officers attempt to influence retirement villages' internal layouts based on their understanding of design principles which only apply to traditional housing types. Additional content should be linked into RESZ-P13 to provide for and acknowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons; and</li> <li>- The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

			<p>space, for residents is provided, which reflects the nature of and diverse needs of residents of the village;</p> <p>4. The site can accommodate the scale and intensity of the activity, in terms of its size, topography and location; and</p> <p>5. The overall scale, form, composition, and design of buildings does not compromise the planned urban built form of the zone or precinct they are located in.</p>	
FS67.76	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 10-RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones > 10.4-Policies > 10.4.14-RESZ-P14 Other activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.115	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy.
FS17.783	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.148	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.122	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS4.4	Philippa Sargent	Amend	Amend the proposal so that high density housing is not permitted in areas prone to flooding or coastal inundation.	These hazard prone areas are already facing natural threats and adding more residents needing access to their homes will compound pressure during hazard events. It also adds pressure following an event when/if reinstatement or maintenance of affected properties is needed. In addition, access for emergency vehicles could be compromised during and after hazard events.
FS17.14	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS6.1	Francesse Middleton	Oppose	Would like council to remove the area Pascoe Ave south on both sides and retain as medium density.	<p>This provision totally changes the outlook along Mana Esplanade into a high rised residential area. It changes the outlook for many in the area into a built up environment.</p> <p>The development of high buildings in this area will change the environment for ever. At present the infrastructure cannot deal with intensity and increasing the overflows into the harbour jeopardizes that natural environment.</p>
FS17.16	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS20.1	Kathleen Ahipene	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission].	<p>Supports the high density plan for Plimmerton for the following reasons:</p> <p>More affordable for those needing to downsize and wanting to stay in the village.</p> <p>Affordable for those wishing to live in a seaside village.</p> <p>To be able to take advantage of the nearby facilities, buses, trains, medical centre, supermarket to name a few.</p> <p>High decile primary school.</p> <p>More affordable to a wider social mix.</p> <p>Considers these points are relevant to support high density.</p>

FS17.601	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.118	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Propose a new height variation control (36m maximum height) to enable more height in HRZ in the Plan. This is shown in Appendix 3.	<p>Opportunities for further high density housing should be explored to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres and Rapid Transit Stops in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Does not support the introduction of the qualifying matter applying to steep south facing sites and associated height restrictions. Seeks the removal of these areas from the mapped extent of the HRZ.</p> <p>Also seeks the rezoning of MUZ land to HRZ on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange to HRZ.</p>
FS17.786	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.13	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage

				<p>increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building. Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with the proposed district plan zones.</p>
FS72.34	KiwiRail	Support	<p>Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.</p>	<p>KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.</p>
FS99.151	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the</p>



				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.67	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We seek that this part of this submission that suggests introducing high density residential zones around walkable catchments is disallowed.	We oppose to rezoning areas around these suggested rapid transit stops as high-density residential zones because it is unclear how it has been decided that intensified development is appropriate in these areas. This submission also does not outline how the potential effects on the natural environment and water bodies will be managed in relation to the intensified development.
FS114.79	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request the part of the submission seeking to increase the residential height of Takapūwāhia and rezoning to High Density Residential Zone is disallowed.	We oppose increasing the residential height in Takapūwāhia. Enabling intensified development without appropriate controls puts pressure on our taiao and does not prioritise Te Mana o te Wai or climate resilience. This should be an area for Ngāti Toa to have tino rangatiratanga and decide how Ngāti Toa iwi would like development to occur on their whenua.
FS127.125	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS81.5	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	The relevant noise provisions should be included as a qualifying matter within the High Density Residential Zone provisions.	The PDP includes noise and vibration requirements for noise sensitive activities adjacent the state highway network. The noise and vibration requirements support the upzoning by protecting the health and amenity of future residents who will live in the new dwellings. There is a transitional period before the proposed district-wide noise provisions are made operative. In order to provide for a healthy indoor and outdoor noise environment for residents of new buildings in the Medium Density Residential Zones, the reverse sensitivity provisions should also be included as a qualifying matter.
FS17.1039	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.393	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora does not support the relief sought and does not consider that these issues are qualifying matters.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS38.19	Amos Mann	Amend	Add a standard requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS38.20	Amos Mann	Amend	Make the zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

OS53.23	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Seeks that the relief sought in its submission points to the MRZ also apply to the HRZ, should the HRZ extent be amended such that existing National Grid assets traverse the zone.	On the basis the extent of the High- Density Residential Zone is not amended, the submitter is neutral on the extent (as notified) and nature of provisions on the High-Density Residential zone. Should the zone extent be amended such that existing National Grid assets traverse the zone, seeks that the relief sought in its submission points to the MRZ also apply to the HRZ.
FS17.634	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS60.3	Rosie Gallagher	Amend	Add a standard requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.258	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS60.4	Rosie Gallagher	Amend	Seeks that the zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.259	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.18	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Expand design flexibility and threshold for permitted residential development.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve</li> </ul>

				<p>the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.686	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.63	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.51	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.25	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.19	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Increase height limits from 22m to 36m when proximate to the Metropolitan Centre Zone (within 400m) as an additional Height Variation Control.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.687	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.6	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building (see Appendix 2). Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building

				renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction <sup>1</sup> . See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with the proposed District Plan zones.
FS75.62	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.52	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.65	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that this section of the submission, which proposes extending the Metropolitan Centre Zone and increasing height limits for development proximate to this zone, is disallowed.	We oppose to the suggestion of increasing height limits and the extension of the Metropolitan Centre Zone. The suggested extension of the Metropolitan Centre Zone would impact Takapūwāhia Pa which is within the suggested 400m of this zone and would mean that height variation controls are increased in Takapūwāhia Pa, which is a contemporary site of significance to Ngāti Toa.
FS127.26	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.20	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Remove restrictive controls limiting development on steep, south facing slopes.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as</li> </ul>



				<p>to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.688	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.59	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.73	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and

				contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS37.10	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	The whole of this submission should be disallowed.	Toka Tū Ake supports restrictions on development on steep slopes in order to reduce land sliding hazard. Though the provision in the Proposed District Plan relates to minimizing shading of surrounding residences, we consider that the provision also acts to limit development on slopes which may be subject to landslide hazard and should therefore be retained.
FS74.110	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS75.61	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.53	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.27	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.21	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Alter the control used to manage effects on scheduled heritage sites and settings and sites of significance to Māori.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.689	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.120	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS74.130	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that controls on height to protect sites of significance Māori are retained as notified except as requested in the original submission.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting the controls restricting building heights on sites adjacent to sites of significance to Māori. This would not give effect to the Operative RPS or have regard to Proposed Change 1 to

				the RPS. It is noted that Greater Wellington's original submission supported including a new qualifying matter to require setbacks from sites of significance to Māori in conjunction with restrictions on height and height in relation to boundaries.
FS75.60	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.54	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.63	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the part of the submission seeking altering the control used to manage effects on scheduled sites of significance is disallowed.	We oppose to the proposed suggestion that is to alter the control used to manage effects on scheduled sites of significance. The controls that are currently put in place to protect sites of significance and values from inappropriate development and adverse effects.
FS127.28	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.22	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Remove reference to statutory design guide(s) and introduce alternative guidance directly into provisions.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required</li> </ul>

				<p>under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.690	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.59	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.55	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is

				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.29	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.23	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Introduce flexibility to enable commercial activities at ground floor of apartment buildings through a defined consent pathway.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>



FS17.691	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.58	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.56	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.30	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.24	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revisions to notification preclusion statements.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.692	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.57	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.57	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.31	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>

OS76.122	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><i>[Paragraph One Changes]:</i></p> <p>The High Density Residential Zone provides for residential activities with a high intensity and bulk of buildings, including apartments <del>and townhouses</del>, and other compatible activities. <u>It is anticipated that the urban built form, appearance, and amenity of residential environments within the Zone will change over time.</u></p>	<p>Generally supports the introduction statement to the HRZ. Changes are sought as follows:</p> <p>Additional sentence at the end of paragraph one to explicitly state that the urban form and amenity will change over time, consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD</p> <p>New paragraph to note that more intensive urban form is enabled and anticipated around the MCZ</p>
FS17.790	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS99.155	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>

FS118.183	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Allow amendment sought by Kāinga Ora on this submission point.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
FS127.129	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.16	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide for retirement villages.	Older people want to stay in the communities in which they currently live, and have lived for many years, during their retirement. This is called 'ageing in place'. It allows residents to remain close to their families, friends, familiar amenities and other support networks. It promotes activities that improve residents' wellbeing, including physical activity, social engagement and intergenerational activity, due to the easily accessible surrounding destinations in a familiar neighbourhood. It allows residents to access public transport to facilitate these activities as independent driving ability declines and climate change impact increases. It allows residents to continue to play an integral part in the communities that they helped establish. For these reasons, the majority of retirement village residents come from dwellings located in surrounding suburbs. Both the Auckland Unitary Plan and Christchurch District Plan provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted

				<p>discretionary activity in the key residential zones. Sites in existing residential areas that are appropriate for retirement villages are extremely rare. Sites of the required size and in good locations are highly unique and valuable resources in our larger cities. They need to be efficiently used.</p> <p>The need to provide for older persons to 'age in place', the inappropriateness of traditional intensification models, and lack of appropriate sites for retirement villages, means that achieving the objective of providing appropriate housing and care for older persons requires a planning framework that enables retirement villages.</p>
FS67.18	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.8	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	A site coverage requirement of no more than 80% should be imposed.	<p>There is no site coverage in this zone. Minimal setback provisions in HRZ S4. If developments are part of a precinct that has been subject of urban design across multiple sites and which incorporates appropriate collective open space, this requirement could be waived.</p> <p>Having as much landscaped open space as feasible will materially help absorb and reduce water run-off.</p>

FS17.62	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.459	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS58.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	New objective:  <b><u>HRZ-OX Infrastructure</u></b>  <b><u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></b>	Seeks an objective, policy and rule framework within the High Density Residential Zone that ensures activities are adequately serviced with water supply or other method for firefighting purposes.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.163	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.16	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should

				be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.
FS118.153	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary given the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.31	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<b><u>HRZ-PX Servicing</u></b>  <i><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></i>	Seeks an objective, policy and rule framework within the High Density Residential Zone that ensures activities are adequately serviced with water supply or other method for firefighting purposes.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.164	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.154	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary given the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.36	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new standard:  <b><u>HRZ-SX Servicing</u></b>  1. <i><u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all</u></i>	New standard ensures all land use activities in the zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.



			<p><u>developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	
FS17.169	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.155	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.
OS76.123	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  [New Paragraph]  <u>Some areas have been identified as being suited to a more intensive built form</u>	Generally supports the introduction statement to the HRZ. Changes are sought as follows:  Additional sentence at the end of paragraph one to explicitly state that the urban form

			<u>through increased building heights than the standard zone height. These areas are located within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone. They are identified on the planning maps as Height Variation Controls.</u>	and amenity will change over time, consistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD  New paragraph to note that more intensive urban form is enabled and anticipated around the MCZ
FS17.791	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.19	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building. Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk

				from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with proposed district plan zones.
FS99.156	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.130	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS83.13	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Add a standard requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel for the building's users as the first-best choice for accessing it.	This could include things like street-frontage space that's pleasant for bike and scooter parking, or a secure and readily accessible room.

FS17.1098	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS85.11	Metlifecare Limited	Not Stated	The High Density Residential zone provisions should provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity.	<p>As currently drafted the construction of a retirement village would also require resource consent (under the general building / structure rules in the High Density and Medium Density Residential zones). The Proposed Plan provides that "all buildings and structures" that infringe one or more of the built form standards (i.e. buildings with greater than three units) are a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion relate to the specific standards that are not met. For example, for more than three units, the matter of discretion is consistency with the Residential Design Guide.</p> <p>Generally supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments. It also supports that the rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>However not all of the standards that relate to the construction of buildings and structures are applicable to retirement village development. For example, outdoor living space (per unit) and outlook space (per unit) requirements should not apply to retirement village development as these types of developments are designed for older residents and generally have</p>

				<p>communal outdoor spaces (which are maintained by the village provider) rather than individual backyard or outdoor living areas that would need to be maintained by the residents. There are also a range of housing typologies within a retirement village including dementia care units where the provision of outlook space should not unnecessarily constrain the design of these care facilities. The relevant matters of discretion are the general residential policies for all residential zones (not including the retirement village specific policy). These do not refer to retirement villages or the policy applicable to retirement villages and do not recognise the specific functional and operational needs of retirement village development.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
--	--	--	--	--

FS17.448	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.40	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Retirement villages need to be provided for as a residential activity and enabled as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rule that permits the use and operation of retirement villages, recognising that this activity is expected and encouraged in residential zones;</li> <li>• A rule that regulates the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, recognising that this activity is anticipated in residential zones with limited matters requiring assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>Retirement villages are required to be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS as they require "the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site". The Variation includes Rules HRZ-R19 and MRZ-R22, which regulate retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The restricted discretionary status is inappropriate as it does not recognise that retirement villages are an appropriate activity in residential zones. Therefore seeks a permitted activity rule for the use and operation of retirement villages (consistent with HRZ-R5 and MRZ-R5 for other residential activity). The Variation regulates the construction of retirement villages under Rules HRZ-R1 and MRZ-R1. Supports the restricted discretionary activity status that would apply to retirement villages under these rules (being four or more residential units on a site), but opposes the matters of discretion.</p>
FS67.42	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.3-Objective > 11.3.1-HRZ-O1 Planned urban built environment of the High Density Residential Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS69.1	Michelle Smart	Oppose	Amend:  Within CBD only, not in suburban areas, upgraded infrastructure, provision for environment and greenspaces, improved access to public transport and social services.	Pressure on infrastructure, destruction of natural environment and greenspaces, increased flooding and slips, increased shading, special character erosion, lack of social services and amenities, limited access to public transport.
FS17.288	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.124	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  The planned urban built environment in the High Density Residential Zone is characterised by:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A planned built form of terraced housing and apartments buildings, predominantly six storeys in height <u>and up to ten storeys in identified Height Variation Control areas;</u></li> <li>2. A greater intensity of buildings than anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone and the MRZ-Residential Intensification Precinct;</li> </ol>	Generally supports this objective, which clearly sets out the planned urban built environment of the HRZ but seeks changes to enable further intensification.

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. A quality-built environment that provides for the health and well-being of people and communities residing in the Zone; and</li> <li>4. An urban environment that is visually attractive, safe, easy to navigate and convenient to access.</li> </ol>	
FS17.792	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.15	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building. Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends



				restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with the proposed district plan zones.
FS99.157	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.131	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.24	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy as it identifies the characteristics of the High-Density Residential Zone. This is in accordance with NPS-UD Policy 3(c).

FS17.1058	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.55	KiwiRail	Support	Accept submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission
OS89.1	Elijah Smart	Oppose	Amend: Within CBD only, not in suburban areas, upgraded infrastructure, provision for environment and greenspaces, improved access to public transport and social services	Oppose: Pressure on infrastructure, destruction of natural environment and greenspaces, increased flooding and slips, increased shading, special character erosion, lack of social services and amenities, limited access to public transport
FS17.461	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS114.7	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>HRZ is not an objective and describes the Zone. Te Rūnanga are unsure the way in which the need for speed of giving effect to the NPS-UD have generated adequate consideration and addition of objectives and policies into this Chapter.</p> <p>It is not clear in the drafting why HRZ is promoted because it will encourage a better use of land supporting the reduction of our emissions or we will endeavour to reduce our construction and building footprint in the face of growing population? The interface with Taiao is not clear in articulating the purpose of this Zone Chapter.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>

FS17.535	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.398	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.78	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain HRZ-O1 as notified.	Supports HRZ-O1 and the planned urban built environment it supports for the High Density Residential Zone as it aligns with NPSUD Policy 3.
FS67.80	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.1-HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.79	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that HRZ-R1 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:  <b>HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls</b>	To provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.  Supports HRZ-R1 and the permitting of buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. Retirement

		<p>a. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b> Where:</p> <p>b. ....</p> <p>c. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where:</p> <p>d. Compliance is not achieved with <del>HRZ-S1, HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4, HRZ-S5, HRZ-S6, HRZ-S7, or HRZ-S8</del> <u>HRZ-R1(1)(a)</u>. Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>e. The matters of discretion of any infringed standards.</p> <p>f. <u>Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></u> <u>Where:</u> g. <u>Compliance is not achieved with R1(1)(a).</u> h. <u>The application is for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> i. <u>The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u> j. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> k. <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> l. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> m. <u>When assessing the matters in 1 - 5,</u></p>	<p>villages will likely infringe the number of residential units per site standard (HRZ-S1), so the construction of retirement villages will be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. The construction of retirement villages should have a focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). Retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity, and that it should instead only be the construction of the retirement village that is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>When considering the matters of discretion that are currently applicable to retirement villages under HRZ-R19 (being RESZ-P13), the additional provision / recognition is required for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents. The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages.</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p><u>consider:</u></p> <p><u>n. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>o. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>p. 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><b>Notification:</b></p> <p>q. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with HRZ-S1, HRZ-S6 or HRZ-S7 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p> <p>r. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4, HRZ-S5, or HRZ-S8 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</p> <p><u>s. An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>t. An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village where compliance is achieved with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3 and HRZ-S4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	
FS67.81	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

**11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.1-HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 11.4.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.32	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  ...  <i>HRZ-SX is complied with.</i>	It is noted that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision consent, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the SUB – Subdivision chapter. Therefore, additional standards that will require the provision of firefighting water supply and access where development is not subject to subdivision provisions are requested.
FS17.165	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

**11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.1-HRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 11.4.1.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.125	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><i>Change non-notification clause associated with HRZ-R1(2) as follows:</i></p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <a href="#">HRZ-S1</a>, <a href="#">HRZ-S5</a>, <a href="#">HRZ-S6</a>, <del>or</del> <a href="#">HRZ-S7</a> <del>of</del> <a href="#">HRZ-S8</a> is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</li> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <a href="#">HRZ-S3</a>, <del>or</del> <a href="#">HRZ-S4</a> <a href="#">HRZ-S5</a>, <del>or</del> <a href="#">HRZ-S8</a> is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</li> </ul>	Generally supports this rule. Changes are sought to preclude HRZ-S5 and HRZ-S8 – i.e., a breach to the landscaping and window glazing standards from limited notification. These standards are design/public realm standards, and not a matter in which notification of neighbours would be warranted.
FS17.793	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.158	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.132	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.2-HRZ-R2 Construction activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.126	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend: HRZ-R2 Construction <u>and demolition</u> activity	Supports this permitted activity rule in general but seeks amendment to the chapeau of the rule to make it clear that demolition is also a permitted activity.
FS17.794	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.159	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is



			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.133	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.3-HRZ-R3 Rainwater tank

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.127	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.795	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.160	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.134	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.4-HRZ-R4 Fences and stand-alone walls

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.128	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.

FS17.796	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.161	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.135	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.5-HRZ-R5 Residential activity, excluding papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS76.129	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.797	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.162	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.136	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.6-HRZ-R6 Conservation activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.130	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.798	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.163	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.137	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.7- HRZ-R7 Customary harvesting

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.131	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.799	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.164	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.138	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.8- HRZ-R8 Sport and recreation facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.132	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.800	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.165	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.139	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.9- HRZ-R9 Supported residential care activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.4	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Support	Retain Rule HRZ-R9.	<p>Rule HRZ-R9 provides for “supported residential accommodation” as a permitted activity in the newly proposed High Density Residential Zone, which includes housing, and associated care and support for people following their release, to assist with their transition and integration back into the community; and housing for those on bail or community-based sentences.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
OS76.133	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <p>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved is precluded from being publicly <b>or limited</b> notified in accordance with sections <b>95A and 95B</b> of the RMA.</p>	<p>Supports the permitted activity status of this activity.</p> <p>Seeks preclusion to limited notification in the event the occupation threshold is breached.</p>
FS17.801	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.166	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may



			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.140	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.10-HRZ-R10 Home business

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.134	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.802	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.167	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.141	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.11-HRZ-R11 Educational facility, including home-based childcare services

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.135	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.

FS17.803	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.168	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.142	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.12-HRZ-R12 Visitor accommodation

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS76.136	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.804	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.169	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.143	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.13-HRZ-R13 Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.137	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.805	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.170	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.144	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.8	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	All permissive levels should be the same, 100 square meters is too small for bringing any commercial activity into fruition and this should be amended	In HRZ-R14, Papakāinga is a permitted activity and restricted if on 'General title land'. Te Rūnanga are concerned, under this rule, all commercial activities are restricted to 100 square

			<p>Amend inconsistencies regarding community activities.</p> <p>Amend standards throughout the Plan so that it is consistent.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>meters which is too low but also a number that is inconsistent with other parts of the Plan Chapters.</p> <p>Community activity is also inconsistent for the rest of the Plan, Te Rūnanga are unsure of where the discrepancy that they observe throughout the Plan comes from. Te Rūnanga are unclear the standards laid out in this Chapter has cross consistency with Papakāinga as the numbers will be up to iwi and whānau to implement full Tino Rangatiratanga on their land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision reason]</p>
FS17.536	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.399	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.14-HRZ-R14 Show home

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.138	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this rule.
FS17.806	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.171	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.145	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.15-HRZ-R15 Community garden

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.139	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.807	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.172	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.146	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.16-HRZ-R16 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.140	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule



FS17.808	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.173	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.147	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

**11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.16-HRZ-R16 Emergency service facility > 11.4.16.1-1. Activity status: Restricted discretionary**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.33	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Notes that rule allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.166	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.17-HRZ-R17 Community facility, excluding healthcare activities and hospitals

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.141	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.809	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.174	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.148	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.18-HRZ-R18 Healthcare activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.142	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.810	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.175	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.149	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.19-HRZ-R19 Retirement village

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.143	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.811	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.176	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.184	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	The RVA seeks to have their original submission point included (providing for retirement villages as a use as a permitted activity) and to disallow this submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.150	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS85.5	Metlifecare Limited	Amend	Seeks that rule HRZ-R19 be amended to provide for retirement villages are as a permitted activity.	Rule HRZ-R19 provides that retirement villages are a restricted discretionary activity in the High Density Residential zones, with matters of discretion being those set out in RESZ-P13. It is appropriate

				<p>to recognise and enable retirement village use as permitted in residential zones.</p> <p>Proposes that RESZ-P13 remains relevant to the construction of a retirement village as a restricted discretionary activity, meaning that the applicant will still need to address these matters for a new retirement village development.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.442	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.80	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity (with the construction of a retirement villages provided for as a	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule in principle. Retirement villages as a land use activity should be classified as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a permitted or restricted discretionary

			<p>restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R1).</p> <p><b>HRZ-R19 Retirement village</b></p> <p>1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del> <b>Permitted</b></p> <p><del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del></p> <p><del>1. The matters in RESZ-P13.</del></p> <p><del>Notification:</del></p> <p><del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</del></p>	<p>activity under HRZ-R1). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>
FS67.82	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.20-HRZ-R20 Commercial activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS83.18	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	<p>The zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities. Public-facing commercial activities beneath 50m2 footprint, and meeting design guide requirements for sticky and active street frontage, should be restricted discretionary with discretion matters limited to their enablement of low carbon transport.</p>	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

FS17.1103	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS104.8	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Seeks greater enablement of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.504	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.20-HRZ-R20 Commercial activity > 11.4.20.1-1. Activity status: Discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.144	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p><b>Commercial Activity</b></p> <p><del>1. Activity status: Discretionary</del></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p>	Supports a rule applying to commercial activities but seeks changes to this rule to enable commercial activities on ground floor to be specifically enabled via a Restricted Discretionary Activity consent pathway. Small scale commercial activities, such as cafes, convenience stores, and hairdressers, provide amenity to residents in a walkable urban setting and increase the vibrancy of an area. Operating thresholds have been incorporated to ensure such activities do not detract from the underlying residential environment.



			<p><u>Where:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The commercial activity is limited to the ground floor tenancy of an apartment building;</u></li> <li>2. <u>The gross floor area of the commercial activity/activities does not exceed 200m<sup>2</sup>; and</u></li> <li>3. <u>The hours of operation are between:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>7.00am and 9.00pm Monday to Friday; and</u></li> <li>2. <u>8.00am and 7.00pm Saturday, Sunday, and public holidays.</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The matters in RESZ-P11.</u></li> </ol> <p><b><u>2. Activity status: Discretionary</u></b></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Compliance is not achieved with HRZ-R20-1.a, HRZ-R20-1.b, or HRZ-R20-1.c.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.812	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.177	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.151	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.21-HRZ-R21 Any activity not listed as a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.145	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.813	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.178	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.152	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	---

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.22- HRZ-R22 Industrial activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.146	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.814	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.179	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.153	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.23-HRZ-R23 Rural industry

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.147	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.815	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.180	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.154	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.24-HRZ-R24 Hospital

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.148	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule
FS17.816	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.181	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.155	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.4-Rules > 11.4.25-HRZ-R25 Primary production

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.149	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.817	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.182	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.156	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS79.12	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Amend	A maximum building coverage standard should be stated for the HRZ	This would provide for adequate permeable surfaces, onsite communal or private recreation spaces and the opportunity for landscaping.
FS17.430	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.377	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS104.7	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Seeks a standard be added requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]



FS17.503	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS112.6	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks that reference be provided in the HRZ standards to the effect that discretion can be applied to the matters in INF-P5.	The VA1 Rule preamble states "The Infrastructure chapter contains objectives and policies relevant to activities in proximity of regionally significant infrastructure.". Upon review of the Infrastructure Chapter it is further noted that only subdivision objective and policy matters are addressed – not land use. [With reference to INF-P5] discretion can therefore consider the actual and/or potential effects of reverse sensitivity.
FS76.399	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.1-HRZ-S1 Number of residential units per site

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.150	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  <i>HRZ-S1 - Number of residential units per site</i>  1. There must be no more than <del>3</del> <u>6</u> residential units per site; <u>and</u>	Seeks an increased threshold at which point resource consent is required for residential development in the HRZ. Aligned with and giving effect to HRZ – O1: Planned urban built environment of the High Density Residential Zone. A difference in enabled permitted residential units is required

			<p>2. <u>Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>HRZ-S2 – height</u></li> <li>ii. <u>HRZ-S3 - HIRTB;</u></li> <li>iii. <u>HRZ-S4 - only in relation to the rear/side yard boundary setback;</u></li> <li>iv. <u>HRZ-S7– outlook space.</u></li> </ul> <p>3. <u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>i. Where compliance with HRZ-S1(1.) cannot be achieved.</u></p> <ul 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; and</u> <u>The degree to which the development delivers quality on-</u></li> </ul>	<p>between the MRZ and HRZ to incentivise and enable more residential units at a higher-form be built in the HRZ.</p> <p>Appropriate matters of discretion and non-notification clauses are also sought to provide clarity.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p><u>site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u></p> <p><u>ii. Where compliance with HRZ-S1(2.) cannot be achieved:</u></p> <p>4. <u>The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>An application for resource consent which complies with HRZ-S1(1.) but does not comply with HRZ-S1(2.) is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></li> <li><u>An application for resource consent made which does not comply with HRZ-S1(1.) but complies with HRZ-S1(2.) is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></li> <li><u>An application for resource consent made which does not comply with HRZ-S1(1.) and HRZ-S1(2.) but complies with MRZ-S2 height is</u></li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<u>precluded from being either publicly notified.</u>	
FS17.818	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.183	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.157	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.25	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the density standards in accordance with the MDRS standards.

FS17.1059	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS118.81	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amend HRZ-S1 to refer to retirement units. <i>As detailed in response to RESZ-P10 [separate submission point], seeks for the phrasing of RESZ-P10 (being a matter of discretion applicable to HRZ-S1) to be amended.</i>	Supports HRZ-S1 and the number of residential units per site provisions which reflect the number of residential units per site standard of the MDRS. However, it will need to be amended to refer to "retirement units" with the addition of the definition proposed. The inclusion of 'the matters of RESZ-P10' as matters of discretion (being a demonstration that a development is consistent with the Residential Design Guide) is not appropriate for all applications, including when considering retirement villages. The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and provides no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with a substantially differing functional and operational needs).
FS67.83	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

# 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.2-HRZ-S2 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS4.1	Philippa Sargent	Support	Retain and strictly enforce this SASM height control for all the properties which have it assigned to them.	This SASM height control is reasonable for areas of cultural significance. It respects the value of these locations, not just for tangata whenua but for the wider community. It helps ensure built structures do not completely dominate these culturally important areas.
FS17.11	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS4.3	Philippa Sargent	Amend	<p>Amend the variation so that only new developments can build to this height.</p> <p>Amend the variation so that buildings of up to 22m are not permitted in areas of established housing. Keep the lower current height level for these established areas.</p>	<p>Existing property owners with low-level houses would be adversely affected by multi-level buildings in adjacent properties.</p> <p>The proposed increased height will affect people's privacy, sun levels, noise levels, street parking, mental health and their overall quality of life.</p> <p>High density multi-storey housing is not consistent with the current character of many established Porirua villages. It will detrimentally change the appeal of neighbourhoods for existing residents who bought and invested in their properties and local communities on the basis of their current features.</p>

				<p>Having a mix of low and multi-storey homes will create a disjointed unpleasant streetscape for residents.</p> <p>The proposed increased height allowance would disadvantage those rate-payers who cannot afford to match the height of imposing neighbouring buildings, affecting their property values and decreasing their overall quality of life.</p>
FS17.13	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS6.2	Francesse Middleton	Amend	<p>Require geo technical requirements for the land.</p> <p>Require consideration be given to shade cast onto neighbors and methods to mitigate.</p>	<p>Ensure the sustainability of developments in our changing world.</p> <p>Ensure a healthy living environment.</p> <p>Concerned with the capacity of the land to sustain the weight. Have had a very wet winter and concerned with the hillside land being able to carry the weight or the sand south of Pascoe Ave being able to withhold the weight of 22 metres structures.</p> <p>Also concerned about the shading of properties and inadequate sunlight. We all have better mental health if we see the sun.</p>
FS17.17	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS30.1	Diane Richardson	Oppose	Retain current height allowance.	Motuhara Road is narrow, steep and recently becoming unstable and entirely unsuitable for high density housing.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The east and west sides of 44 Motuhara and this part of road are steep. Therefore the angle of slopes would not cope with 16 meter high dwelling</li><li>• This is high wind risk area and again would not suit these types of high density housing</li><li>• The houses in this area of Motuhara Road are already very close together, and buildings would be able to be build up to 16 meters as it would not comply with shading requirements for neighborhood properties</li><li>• There is a vulnerability to earthquakes due to two nearby faultiness.</li><li>• There is already limited parking yet high demand for street car parks as houses do not have car sized garages. High density housing would put more pressure on parking.</li><li>• There is a large slip on the western side of the road threatening houses below and causing further narrowing of an already narrow road. Motuhara Road could not safely cope with more traffic (cars, bikes, pedestrians) that high density would bring.</li><li>• Daily huge trucks loaded with some sort of fill (about three times per</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>day) go up this road. In addition there is a caravan business that brings caravans up and down this road frequently. High density will just put so much more pressure on this road it will be untenable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no access to properties proposed for high density housing from the eastern boundary as properties abut school land.</li> </ul>
FS17.52	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS52.1	Hugh Blank	Oppose	In regard to the High Density Residential Zone in Plimmerton and Mana, the 22m height is too high and not needed.	<p>There will be adverse environmental and social effects, including loss of sun, privacy, shading, and loss of property values.</p> <p>Mana and Plimmerton are existing communities where major planning changes cannot be justified. There is a large greenfields space between Plimmerton and Pukerua Bay, and that is the appropriate place to develop new ideas about higher density housing.</p>
FS17.124	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.34	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend: ...	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally.

			<p><i>This standard does not apply to:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><u><i>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i></u></p>	<p>This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone.</p> <p>Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station.</p> <p>Seeks an exclusion from HRZ-S2 and HRZ-S3 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers</p>
FS17.167	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS62.1	Brent and Erica McDuff	Oppose	Retain at the present height allowances.	<p>The back of the submitter's property on Motuhara Road is a steep slope down to Plimmerton School and the frontage is a steep slope down to sea level, i.e. a long narrow space on a hill unsuitable for high rise housing. The housing on the northern side, at least up to Corlett Road are all in the same situation.</p> <p>The recent slips in the area have been concerning with the soil being prone to erosion. Again, unsuitable for high rise housing.</p>

				<p>Submitter considers the neighbourhood is already high density and there is little space between houses. The proposed higher levels will further increase shade.</p> <p>Parking is already at a premium with a good number of houses having no garaging or offroad parking. Exiting property by car is difficult and will likely become dangerous with less visibility, road parking, and traffic. In summary, in the Submitter's opinion is rather than a blanket change to zoning, that any change should be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration their above concerns.</p>
FS17.265	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.151	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed a height of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 22m;</li> <li>2. <del>16m on sites subject to Height Control—Shading A as identified on the planning maps;</del></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>36m where located within 400m of the edge of the Metropolitan Centre Zone as identified on the Planning Maps as a Height Variation Control.</u></li> </ol>	<p>Supports the height standard of 22m as a starting point. however, seeks greater enablement of more intensive development in proximity to the MCZ – whereby it seeks an increased height limit of 36m within 400m of the MCZ – as shown in the attached maps [to submission] as height variation control.</p> <p>These amendments align with the NPS-UD Policy 3 which enables building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, particularly within walkable distances of</p>

			<p>i. <del>11m on sites subject to Height Control—Heritage A as identified on the planning maps;</del></p> <p>ii. <del>8m on sites subject to Height Control—Heritage C, as identified on the planning maps; and</del></p> <p>iii. <del>8m on sites subject to Height Control—SASM as identified on the planning maps.</del></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Consequential deletion of matters of discretion that refer to policies relevant to the matters being deleted.</i></p>	<p>existing and planned rapid transit stops and amenities.</p> <p>Consistent with its wider submission, does not support the introduction of qualifying matter restricting height to manage effects of shading upon residential sites in areas with steep south facing topography (Height Control – Shading A) and seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.</p> <p>Also does not support the application of height controls on sites that adjoin identified heritage or sites of significance to Māori. Instead, supports the use of HIRB on boundaries adjoining sites with identified values. Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.</p>
FS17.819	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.16	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage

				<p>increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building. Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with the proposed district plan zones.</p>
FS74.123	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	<p>Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.</p>
FS74.131	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that controls on height to protect sites of significance Māori	<p>Greater Wellington oppose deleting the controls restricting building heights on sites adjacent to sites of significance to Māori.</p>

			are retained as notified except as requested in the original submission.	This would not give effect to the Operative RPS or have regard to Proposed Change 1 to the RPS. It is noted that Greater Wellington's original submission supported including a new qualifying matter to require setbacks from sites of significance to Māori in conjunction with restrictions on height and height in relation to boundaries.
FS75.80	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that OS76.151 be disallowed.	Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. OS76.151 is not in the best interests of existing residents.
FS99.184	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.64	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the part of the submission seeking altering the control used to manage effects on scheduled sites of significance is disallowed.	We oppose to the proposed suggestion that is to alter the control used to manage effects on scheduled sites of significance. The controls that are currently put in place

				to protect sites of significance and values from inappropriate development and adverse effects.
FS127.158	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.26	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the maximum height for buildings located within the High-Density Residential Zone as this is in accordance with Policy 3 (c) of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1060	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS100.1	Susan Xuereb	Oppose	Retain at the medium density 14 meter height allowance which exists at present in this proposed high density zone.	<p>The methodology adopted is simplistic and it has not taken into consideration other factors such as slope suitability.</p> <p>The soil I is unconsolidated colluvium which is totally unsuitable to have high density townhouses and apartments etc up to 16meters high and with the angle of the slope on our road it couldn't cope with 16 meter high dwellings.</p> <p>Worries if a neighbour built a 16 meter townhouse that the submitter's house would be shaded. Already very close to each other.</p> <p>The recent slips and the underlying geology in this area must be fully investigated</p>

				before 16 meter buildings can be allowed to be built in the future especially given the slope of the land and that it is unconsolidated colluvium.
FS17.491	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS105.1	Jenny Brash	Oppose	Retain at the present height allowance which exists at present on the submitter's property and for most of their neighbours in this proposed high density zone.	<p>The submitter's property has a very steep bank on the eastern side above Plimmerton School at 26 Motuhara Road. On the western side across the road from the property the bank also falls away steeply and recently after heavy rains there have been a number of slips that are threatening not only the road itself but properties below on Moana Road. PCC is presently doing a geotechnical survey and looking at strengthening retaining walls to protect Motuhara Road and properties below on Moana Road.</p> <p>Has lived in the house for 42 years and has never seen so many slips at once time. This A shaped hill with houses built close to the road and steep back sections abutting the school should not be a high intensity zone because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands the soil is unconsolidated colluvium which is totally unsuitable to have high density townhouses and apartments etc up to 16 metres high and with the angle of the slope of the</li> </ul>



				<p>natural ground it could not cope with 16 metre high dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter's LIM already has a high wind risk built in and the height of the house is 10 metres. Questions whether higher buildings up to 16 metres would have a very severe wind risk.</li> <li>• Questions as the houses in this part of Motuhara Road are already very close to each other, whether any section in future having a 16 metre townhouse built on it probably could not comply with the shading requirements for its neighbours.</li> <li>• Many of the sections have no off road parking and with yellow lines down both sides of the road in the proposed high density zone where would people park. One of the few parking areas across the road from 18 Motuhara Road and used by visitors and neighbours is now perched above 2 large slips in the no exit road – one very recent and being investigated by PCC.</li> <li>• The submitter's LIM outlines the vulnerability of the house to earthquakes being sited between two earthquake fault lines. Can attest - having lived at the property for 42 years to pretty severe shaking when there are earthquakes over category 4.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no access to the eastern boundary of the property as it abuts school land. This is the case for all the properties proposed for high intensity.</li> <li>• Summarises that the recent slips and the underlying geology in this area must be fully investigated before 16 metre buildings can be allowed to be built in future especially given the slope of the land, and the fact that is it consolidated colluvium. The risks and possible future liability to Council could be huge.</li> </ul>
FS17.510	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS107.1	Wallace Richard and Helen Ann Webber On Behalf Of Wallace (Rick) Webber	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Does not support this variation but supports maintaining the present height limits that relate well to the character of Plimmerton. The housing between the beach and Steyne Avenue is subject to potential sea level rise. It seems counter intuitive to be densifying this area. The sections along Steyne Avenue are in general very long and very narrow and are side on to the north. Houses of two storeys cast shadow over the neighbours to the south therefore three storeys or more will exacerbate this problem for existing houses creating negative living spaces.

FS17.519	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.82	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the height breach.	Supports HRZ-S2 which provides for increased height in the zone compared to that of the Medium Density Residential Zone. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P7 and P8 which are opposed [in a separate submission point].
FS67.84	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.3-HRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS40.3	Ian Baxter	Amend	<p>In relation to HRZ-S3 and in the context of the Eastern Side of Motuhara Road numbers 20 – 64, and noting wider implications across the rest of Porirua, seeks the introduction of a recession plane restriction for the MRZ and GRZ to Heritage C.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including reference to a Figure 2 within the submission]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For areas marked Heritage C there is no specific recession plane described in clause HRZ-S3.</li> <li>In Heritage C areas the maximum height is 8 metres and the general recession plane specification for HRZ-S3 is 60 degree from 8 metres above ground level. This will have significant shading effects particularly for roof mounted solar water heaters and photo voltaic (PV) installations.</li> <li>Submitter provides an example case study in Figure 1 in support of submission.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Figure 2 in the submission outlines how the proposed GRZ recession plane rules are more in line with the existing residential zone recession plane rules. This is what property owners are likely to have assumed, when taking shading into account, when making decisions for the installation of solar water heating and PV arrays.</li> <li>• Can provide sun altitude calculations on request.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.93	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.42	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u></p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station.</p> <p>Seeks an exclusion from HRZ-S2 and HRZ-S3 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers.</p>

FS17.175	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.152	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend Standard:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All buildings and structures must not project beyond a: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>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></li> <li>b. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all <u>other</u> boundaries;</li> <li>c. <u>Except no part of any building or structure may project beyond a:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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; or</u></li> <li>ii. <u>60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along any boundary with a site containing a heritage item or heritage setting for sites subject to HIRB Control Heritage B;</u></li> <li>iii. <u>45° recession plane measured from a point 3m vertically above ground level on any boundary with</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Seeks more enabling HIRB control in the HRZ - similar to what is being proposed in Auckland.</p> <p>Also seeks amendments to the situations in which it is appropriate to further restrict the HIRB at the boundary to also include interface effects at the MRZ. Kāinga Ora seeks the amended wording and standard be utilised, which is similar to that used in the Wellington City PDP. Kāinga Ora is seeking regional consistency in situations such as this.</p> <p>Supports the exclusions set out in the standard and seeks that these be retained.</p> <p>Seeks matters contained within RESZ-P8 be included as relevant matters of discretion. Kāinga Ora supports the other listed matters of discretion.</p>

			<p><u>a site containing a heritage item or heritage setting for sites subject to HIRB Control Heritage A;</u>  <u>or</u>  iv. <u>45° recession plane measured from a point 3m vertically above ground level on any boundary with a site containing an identified site of or areas of significance to Māori.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>The matters in RESZ-P7<u>and RESZ-P8</u></p>	
FS17.820	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.185	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is

				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.159	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.83	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend HRZ-S3 so that it does not apply to boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones. Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the breach.	Supports HRZ-S3 in principle which provides for increased height in relation to boundary provisions to those of the Medium Density Residential Zone. Additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P7 which is opposed.
FS67.85	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.4-HRZ-S4 Setbacks

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS25.2	John O'Connell	Oppose	In regard to the High Density Residential Zone in Plimmerton and Mana, the proposed 1m distance from side and rear boundary should be reverted to existing restriction.	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as high density housing will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m height is too high and not needed. The 1m boundary seriously impinges on home dwellers

				privacy and causes shading, potentially leading to health problems. There will be adverse environmental and social effects, including loss of sun, privacy, shading, and loss of property values.
FS17.42	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS52.2	Hugh Blank	Oppose	In regard to the High Density Residential Zone in Plimmerton and Mana, the proposed 1m distance from side and rear boundary be reverted to existing restriction.	<p>The 1m boundary seriously impinges on home dwellers privacy and causes shading, potentially leading to health problems.</p> <p>There will be adverse environmental and social effects, including loss of sun, privacy, shading, and loss of property values.</p> <p>Mana and Plimmerton are existing communities where major planning changes cannot be justified. There is a large greenfields space between Plimmerton and Pukerua Bay, and that is the appropriate place to develop new ideas about higher density housing.</p>
FS17.125	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS70.6	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	<p>Increase the minimum setback requirement from the road for buildings along Mana Esplanade and St Andrews Road.</p> <p>The minimum setback should be adequate to allow property frontage to be acquired to achieve a road corridor width of at least</p>	<p>The road corridor width of Mana Esplanade is substandard for 4 traffic lanes, and it was only approved by the Environment Count on a temporary basis.</p> <p>If the Mana Esplanade and St Andrews Road do not reduce to a single traffic lane in each direction, additional corridor width will</p>



			minimum road design standards and protect the health and safety of residents.	need to be acquired to meet design minimums for traffic and active transport. The minimum setback requirement of 1.5 metres will be inadequate to achieve the increased corridor width and create a worse health and safety environment for tenants/residents than at present.
FS17.295	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS72.6	KiwiRail	Amend	[...]  2. Buildings and structures must not be located within a <del>1.5m</del> <u>5m</u> setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.	The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will: (a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district; (d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure; (e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.

FS17.303	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.								
FS76.373	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as the proposed 1.5m set back provides 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.								
OS76.153	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Yard</th> <th>Minimum depth</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Front</td> <td><del>1.5 metres, where that boundary is to a road, otherwise it must be 1 metre</del></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side</td> <td>1m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rear</td> <td>1 metre (excluded on corner sites)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yard	Minimum depth	Front	<del>1.5 metres, where that boundary is to a road, otherwise it must be 1 metre</del>	Side	1m	Rear	1 metre (excluded on corner sites)	Seeks amendments to enable buildings to be constructed to the front boundary.
Yard	Minimum depth											
Front	<del>1.5 metres, where that boundary is to a road, otherwise it must be 1 metre</del>											
Side	1m											
Rear	1 metre (excluded on corner sites)											
FS17.821	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.								
FS81.46	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Allow	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point on the basis that the relevant access and on-site manoeuvring standards can be met for sites adjacent the state highway network.								

FS99.186	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.160	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS106.2	Michael Kearns	Oppose	The 1m distance from side and rear boundary is too close to existing dwellings [HRZ in Plimmerton and Mana].	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as sees no need for high housing density in the areas indicated.  The 22m height is too high and not needed.  The 1m boundary seriously impinges on home dwellers privacy and causes shading, potentially leading to health problems.

				<p>There will be adverse environmental and social effects, including loss of sun, privacy, shading, and loss of property values.</p> <p>Health and safety issues:</p> <p>Safety for children coming and going to local schools with more cars parked on the roads. Stress for existing homes owners with the fear that developers can buy existing houses, tear them down and build 22m high buildings with no consultation.</p>
FS17.512	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS116.3	Frances Dodge	Oppose	Increase the front yard setback back to 5m or at least 3m in all zones.	Plimmerton Farms is not within walking distance to Porirua CBD. There are no local highschools. There is only 1 intermediate school for the entire area which is already at capacity. People will need cars to go to the CBD and to and from school at a minimum given it will almost 100% be outside of the Plimmerton area. Whilst some of Plimmerton Farms is within walkable distance to the train station, you cannot do your weekly grocery shop on the train. Kids sports and activities are at all hours of the day and public transport does not suffice. Cars will overrun the streets which are also proposed to be extremely narrow as seen in other developments.
FS17.591	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS118.84	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the breach.	Supports HRZ-S4 and the setback provisions which predominantly reflect the setback standard of the MDRS. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P7 and P8 which are opposed.
FS67.86	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.5-HRZ-S5 Landscaped area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.9	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	Landscaped areas should be increased to 30%.	Having as much landscaped open space as feasible will materially help absorb and reduce water run-off
FS17.63	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.460	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.154	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters in RESZ-P8.</li> <li>2. <a href="#">How proposed landscaping enhances onsite and/or streetscape amenity;</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">The appropriateness of any planting (including location, extent, and species selection) to the local</a></li> </ul>	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.  Seeks amendments to further clarify the matters of discretion.

			<p><u>climatic environment or the presence of infrastructure;</u></p> <p>4. <u>The extent of tree and garden planting between the building and the road boundary to soften and integrate the development into the surrounding area;</u></p> <p>5. <u>The extent to which the breach is necessary to enable more efficient, cost effective and/or practical use of the remainder of the site; and</u></p> <p>6. <u>Any additional accessibility and safety benefits of providing less landscaped area.</u></p>	
FS17.822	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.187	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.185	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the landscape area standard of the MDRS.
FS127.161	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.85	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Amend the matter of discretion to refer to adequate provision of landscaping and planting to meet the needs of the residents. Seeks to amend HRZ-S5 as follows to provide for retirement units:</p> <p><b>HRZ-S5 Landscaped area</b></p> <p>1. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have 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.</p> <p>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 <u>or retirement unit</u>.</p>	Supports HRZ-S5 and the landscaped area provisions which reflect the landscaped area standard of the MDRS however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.
FS67.87	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

# 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.6-HRZ-S6 Outdoor living space - Per unit

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS6.3	Francesse Middleton	Amend	Increase each units separate outdoors space.	<p>Provide a healthy living environment and connection with the real world.</p> <p>Having lived through Covid, considers that it is important that individuals and family units have sufficient space to isolate outside without risking the health of others by being too close. This also provides green space, a healthy living requirement.</p>
FS17.18	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.155	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters in RESZ-P7;</li> <li>2. <u>The extent to which outdoor living spaces provide useable space, contribute to overall on-site spaciousness, and enable access to sunlight throughout the year for occupants;</u></li> <li>3. <u>The accessibility and connection of the outdoor living space to the internal living area for occupiers of</u></li> </ol>	<p>Supports this standard and the additional flexibility that has been incorporated over and above the MDRS.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to further clarify the matters of discretion.</p>



			<p><u>the residential unit(s) that the outdoor living space services;</u></p> <p>4. <u>Whether the size, sunlight access and quality of on-site communal outdoor living space or other open space amenity compensates for any reduction in private outdoor living space;</u></p> <p>5. <u>The extent to which a reduction in outdoor living space will result in retention of mature on-site vegetation;</u></p> <p>6. <u>Proximity of the residential unit to accessible public open space; and</u></p> <p>7. <u>The provision of space for bicycle storage, servicing, washing lines and heat-pump units elsewhere on the site.</u></p>	
FS17.823	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.188	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.186	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS.
FS127.162	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.86	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Seeks to amend HRZ-S6 as follows to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard:</p> <p><b>HRZ-S6 Outdoor living space (per unit)</b></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>4. For retirement units, clause 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</u></p> <p><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</u></p> <p><u>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></p> <p>Delete reference to RESZ-P7 from the matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Acknowledges HRZ-S6 and the outdoor living space provisions reflect the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to HRZ-S6 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standards. The matter of discretion refers to RESZ-P7 which is opposed. Matter of discretion (2) is supported.</p>
FS67.88	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	



## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.7-HRZ-S7 Outlook space - Per unit

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.156	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
FS17.824	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.189	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.163	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.87	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Seeks to amend HRZ-S7 as follows:  <b>HRZ-S7 Outlook space (per unit)</b>  ... <u>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>  Delete reference to RESZ-P7 from the matters of discretion.	To provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.  Supports HRZ-S7 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS. In a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. Amendments should be made to HRZ-S7 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages. The matter of discretion refers to RESZ-P7 which is opposed.
FS67.89	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.8-HRZ-S8 Windows to street

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.157	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
FS17.825	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.190	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.164	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.88	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks to amend HRZ-S8 as follows to provide for retirement units:  <b>HRZ-S8 Windows to street</b> 1. Any residential 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. 2. This standard only applies to sites with a direct frontage to a <u>public</u> road and the	Supports HRZ-S8 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the MDRS. The standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.

			residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> is within 15m of that frontage.	
FS67.90	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.9-HRZ-S9 Rainwater tanks

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.158	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The volume of any individual rainwater tank must not exceed 5000 litres per site.</li> <li>2. <u>Rainwater tanks must not be located in a front yard, unless</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>They are at least 1.5m from the front boundary; and</u></li> <li>b. <u>They are a maximum height of 1m</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>3. <u>Rainwater tanks in any 'outlook space' must not be higher than 1m.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Rainwater tanks must not exceed 3m in height in a side or rear yard.</u></li> </ol>	Generally supports the management of effects resulting from large rainwater tanks. Kāinga Ora seeks additional standards be included to assist in achieving the overarching quality design outcomes.
FS17.826	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.191	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.165	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 11-HRZ - High Density Residential Zone > 11.5-Standards > 11.5.10-HRZ-S10 Fences and standalone walls along boundaries

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.35	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:	The erection of fences and walls can obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to



			<p>1. All fences and standalone walls must not <del>exceed a maximum height above ground level of:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 1.2m for the length of the site boundary where that boundary is located between the front of a principal building and a road, except that the height above ground level can be up to 2m for up to 30% of the length of the boundary with a road;</u></li> <li>b. <u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 1.2m where a site boundary adjoins a public reserve, vested to Porirua City Council under the Reserves Management Act; and</u></li> <li>c. <u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 2m for all other site boundaries.</u></li> <li>d. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u></li> </ul>	ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ.
FS17.168	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS70.7	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	Allow fences and standalone walls of up to 2 metres in height along the length of a site boundary with Mana Esplanade and St	Walls and fences have been a means of helping reduce road noise for houses in Mana Esplanade and St Andrews Road. Future development may require similar

			Andrews Road greater than 30%, where this is appropriate for road noise reduction.	intervention with higher walls or fences over a wider boundary coverage.
FS17.296	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.159	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <del>1.2m</del> <u>1.5m</u> for the length of the site boundary where that boundary is located between the front of a principal building and a road, except that the height above ground level can be up to 2m for up to <del>30</del><u>50</u>% of the length of the boundary with a road;</li> <li>b. <del>1.2m</del> <u>1.5m</u> where a site boundary adjoins a public reserve, vested to Porirua City Council under the Reserves Management Act, <u>or up to 2m where the section above 1.5m is at least 50% visually permeable;</u> and</li> <li>c. 2m for all other site boundaries.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Generally supports this standard, but seeks additional flexibility, while achieving quality design outcomes.
FS17.827	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.192	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters

			rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.166	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.89	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend standard to provide for higher height of fences where some permeability is provided.	The fence height limit is opposed as it does not provide for the safety and security needs of retirement villages.
FS67.91	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 12-GRZ - General Residential Zone > 12.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.90	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Retain deletion.	Supports the deletion of this zone.

FS67.92	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
---------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS81.4	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	The relevant noise provisions should be included as a qualifying matter within the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions.	The Proposed Porirua District Plan includes noise and vibration requirements for noise sensitive activities adjacent the state highway network. The noise and vibration requirements support the upzoning by protecting the health and amenity of future residents who will live in the new dwellings. There is a transitional period before the proposed district-wide noise provisions are made operative. In order to provide for a healthy indoor and outdoor noise environment for residents of new buildings in the Medium Density Residential Zones, the reverse sensitivity provisions should also be included as a qualifying matter.
FS17.1038	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.392	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora does not support the relief sought and does not consider that these issues are qualifying matters.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS38.13	Amos Mann	Not Stated	That building height limits and recession planes are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS38.14	Amos Mann	Amend	Add a permeability standard, such as that minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (incl permeable pavers / gravel etc).	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS38.15	Amos Mann	Amend	Add the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including weblink provided]	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS38.16	Amos Mann	Amend	Small-scale commercial activity should be controlled or permitted or restricted discretionary, rather than the proposed discretionary.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS38.17	Amos Mann	Amend	The scale of commercial activities that are permitted in these zones should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS38.18	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Enable larger, more comprehensive developments in centres, and increase height limits in the 15-minute walking catchments to rail stations.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

OS53.17	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the introductory text to the MRZ zone, in particular the second bullet point and listing of MRZ-R16.	<p>The Medium Density Residential Zone (“MRZ”) is the only urban area of relevance to the submitter in relation to Variation 1 on the basis existing National Grid assets only traverse the MRZ and no other urban areas (noting the Open Space Zone and Future Urban Zone are not subject to Variation 1).</p> <p>As outlined in the reasoning and assessment provided [in] this submission, the National Grid is a qualifying matter under the RMA.</p> <p>The introductory text to the MRZ zone is supported as it clearly outlines the legal effect and relationship between various provisions within Variation 1 and the 2020 PDP version. Specific to the National Grid, supports reference to MRZ-R16 within the first bullet point.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>
FS17.628	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS60.2	Rosie Gallagher	Amend	Add the Coalition for More Homes’ Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Submitter supports support the Coalition for More Homes’ Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
FS17.257	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS75.1	Roger Gadd	Amend	Reassess the MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct.	<p>Existing services and infrastructure are likely to be insufficient for the degree of intensification proposed, and it may not be possible to upgrade them sufficiently rapidly if rapid growth occurs.</p> <p>The proposed built scale (18m height) is significantly out of scale to the existing built environment. Implementation of this significant height permission may create urban decay through its incompatibility with the existing built environment leading to a deterioration, or predicted deterioration in living quality by existing residents, thereby reducing incentives for them to maintain and improve their properties.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>
FS17.652	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS75.14	Roger Gadd	Support	In regard to the Introduction, exclude the faded text from the District Plan.	The dark text proposed in the 2022 draft is more succinct and better worded.
FS17.665	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.13	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Remove restrictive controls limiting development on steep, south facing slopes.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to</li> </ul>

				<p>achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.681	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.58	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south



				facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.72	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.109	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS75.68	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "

FS99.46	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.20	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.14	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Alter the control used to manage effects on scheduled heritage sites and settings and sites of significance to Māori.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered</li> </ul>

				<p>other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.682	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.119	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS74.129	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that controls on height to protect sites of significance Māori	Greater Wellington oppose deleting the controls restricting building heights on sites adjacent to sites of significance to Māori.

			are retained as notified except as requested in the original submission.	This would not give effect to the Operative RPS or have regard to Proposed Change 1 to the RPS. It is noted that Greater Wellington's original submission supported including a new qualifying matter to require setbacks from sites of significance to Māori in conjunction with restrictions on height and height in relation to boundaries.
FS75.67	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.47	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling,

				manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.62	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the part of the submission seeking altering the control used to manage effects on scheduled sites of significance is disallowed.	We oppose to the proposed suggestion that is to alter the control used to manage effects on scheduled sites of significance. The controls that are currently put in place to protect sites of significance and values from inappropriate development and adverse effects.
FS127.21	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.15	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Remove reference to design guide(s) and introduce alternative guidance directly into provisions.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.683	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.66	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.48	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions,

				disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.22	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.17	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revisions to notification preclusion statements.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul>

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.685	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.64	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.50	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions



				of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.24	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.166	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend [introduction]:  The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for residential areas predominantly used for residential activity with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, <u>enabling</u> a range of dwelling typologies, and other compatible activities. <u>It is anticipated that the urban built form, appearance, and amenity of residential environments within the Zone will change over time.</u>	Generally supports the introduction statement to the MRZ. Changes are sought to paragraph 1.
FS17.834	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.199	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish

				attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.18 7	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Allow amendment sought by Kāinga Ora on this submission point.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.17 3	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS88.3	Nash Alexander	Oppose	In regard to MPZ-P6, Retirement villages should have a kindergarten or other early childhood education on site that elderly residents can be paid to assist at.	There are several studies overseas that show the benefits to both young children and the elderly when they are given opportunities to interact. Kindergartens within retirement villages are the perfect opportunity.
FS17.456	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.15 1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this submission point as it is contrary to, and does not recognise, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.
OS88.4	Nash Alexander	Oppose	In regard to MPZ-P8, opposed to encouraging 3 storey houses that are not in keeping with general street themes, and which do not adequately position themselves on a site.	Submitter has seen several developments where 1 house has been replaced by 6 or more 2 or 3 storey monstrosities. Submitters is concerned how it changes the entire look and feel of

				<p>the street, and especially with regards to lack of planting.</p> <p>Further, the lack of consultation with immediate neighbours prior to design or development taking place results in badly sited homes with big windows to the south, and little windows on the north. Badly placed roof lines on properties lead to a reduction in sunlight for neighbouring properties. 2 or 3 storey buildings should be limited solely to a south side street effect. For example, where two houses are in direct line of sight, facing north, the back house should not be unduly affected by the front house being replaced by monstrosities that limit the sunlight being received by the back property. At present, and especially in Lower Hutt, there are many examples of this happening.</p>
FS17.457	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS113.1	Elizabeth Charlton	Oppose	Retain current residential density standards for applicable stages of Aotea Subdivision.	<p>Some Aotea Subdivision Stage covenants contain a clause which limits the number of dwellinghouses to be erected on a section to one. See for example,</p> <p><a href="https://aoteaporirua.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Aotea-Stage-5-Covenants.pdf">https://aoteaporirua.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Aotea-Stage-5-Covenants.pdf</a></p>

				(viii) Not to erect any more than one dwellinghouse on the land nor subdivide or crosslease the land further unless approved otherwise by Aotea.
FS17.111 9	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS93.3	Alfaaz Lateef	Oppose	Request that the submission be disallowed and covenants either be varied or removed completely (from Whitby, Banks, Navigation Drive), to allow for further subdivision on existing sections to build more than one dwelling per council guidelines. As allowing this submission only benefits the submitter and not other individuals who would like to further intensify housing on their sections given its size.	Opposes old and restricted existing covenants that are in place that restricts housing intensifications, even though if sections in areas of Whitby, Aotea, Banks and Silverwood allows for further housing intensification on a single section, which can be further subdivided given its large unused section size.
FS120.6	Baswa Surukanti	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it</li> </ul>

			<p>need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>	<p>need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>
FS120.7	Baswa Surukanti	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supports the proposed Plan Variation and the outcomes identified in providing for a Porirua city community that is expected to grow exponentially in the next 30 years by over 40%.</li> <li>• Keep medium density zones for aotea subdivision.</li> <li>• Submitter is aware of covenants placed by developer on Aotea sections and would like to know what's the government stand in private covenants placed by big developers and land owners which will impact or even negate the Resource Management Amendment Act 2021 in the future.</li> <li>• Land is very scarce resource and submitter strongly believes we should makes use of land very</li> </ul>	<p>Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</p> <p>Enables young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</p> <p>Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise. The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk porirua city centre ( See attached)</p> <p>Eases housing pressure and help new generations in coming decades to have roof on their head.</p>

			<p>carefully especially in places like wellington where we don't have much land left.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The priority of a major younger generation currently having a roof on their head . If this is not provided then, there is no other option for young kiwis to move overseas. seeandnbsp;<a href="https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/net-migration-loss-continues/#:~:text=There%20were%2049%2C200%20migrant%20arrivals,in%20the%20June%202022%20year.">https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/net-migration-loss-continues/#:~:text=There%20were%2049%2C200%20migrant%20arrivals,in%20the%20June%202022%20year.</a></li> <li>• The very reason for current high inflation in 2022 is housing. Seeandnbsp;<a href="https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/annual-inflation-at-7-3-percent-32-year-high-and-the-proposed-plan-change-will-help-reduce-the-inflation-which-is-caused-by-housing-prices.">https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/annual-inflation-at-7-3-percent-32-year-high-and-the-proposed-plan-change-will-help-reduce-the-inflation-which-is-caused-by-housing-prices.</a></li> </ul>	
OS114.24	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	This chapter could be improved by stating how medium density form, design, and scale that mitigate adverse effects on the health and well-being of people residing in adjacent sites located outside of the Precinct.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]

FS17.552	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.41 5	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.17	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide for retirement villages.	Older people want to stay in the communities in which they currently live, and have lived for many years, during their retirement. This is called 'ageing in place'. It allows residents to remain close to their families, friends, familiar amenities and other support networks. It promotes activities that improve residents' wellbeing, including physical activity, social engagement and intergenerational activity, due to the easily accessible surrounding destinations in a familiar neighbourhood. It allows residents to access public transport to facilitate these activities as independent driving ability declines and climate change impact increases. It allows residents to continue to play an integral part in the communities that they helped establish. For these reasons, the majority of retirement village residents come from dwellings located in surrounding suburbs. Both the Auckland Unitary Plan and Christchurch District Plan provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in the key residential zones. Sites in existing residential areas that are appropriate for

				<p>retirement villages are extremely rare. Sites of the required size and in good locations are highly unique and valuable resources in our larger cities. They need to be efficiently used.</p> <p>The need to provide for older persons to 'age in place', the inappropriateness of traditional intensification models, and lack of appropriate sites for retirement villages, means that achieving the objective of providing appropriate housing and care for older persons requires a planning framework that enables retirement villages.</p>
FS67.19	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.91	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks that paragraph 1 of the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended as follows to provide clarity around the level of residential activity anticipated in the zone:</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for residential areas predominantly used for residential activity <u>that enables more intensive development including medium density development that typically comprises with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings,</u> a range of dwelling typologies, and other compatible activities.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1 of the Introduction refers to the zone comprising of 'residential areas predominantly used for residential activity with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings...'. 'Moderate concentration' is an ambiguous term that is not defined elsewhere in the District Plan, meaning the introduction as currently drafted does not clearly identify the anticipated concentration of buildings in the MDR Zone. The reference to residential activity having a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings does not reflect the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone as set out in the MDRS. The introductory text should acknowledge that the amenity and character of the Medium Density Residential Zone will</p>



				substantially change as a result of the MDRS. It should also acknowledge the broad scope of the MRZ.
FS67.93	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.95	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend RESZ-P13 as set out [in separate submission point].  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Acknowledges that a retirement village specific policy is proposed in Policy RESZ-P13. Its support for the deletion of MRZ-P6 is contingent on the amendments to RESZ-P13.
FS67.97	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.38	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new objective:  <b><u>MRZ-OX Infrastructure</u></b>  <b><u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></b>	Seeks an objective, policy and rule framework within the Medium Density Residential Zone that ensures activities are adequately serviced with water supply or other method for firefighting purposes.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]
FS17.171	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.17	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is

				<p>already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.</p>
FS118.156	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.39	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add new policy:</p> <p><u>MRZ-PX Servicing</u></p> <p><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater,</u></p>	<p>Seeks an objective, policy and rule framework within the Medium Density Residential Zone that ensures activities are adequately serviced with water supply or other method for firefighting purposes. [Refer to original submission for full</p>

			<u>and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	decision requested, including attachment]
FS17.172	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.157	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.46	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add new standard:</p> <p><b><u>MRZ-SX Servicing</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can</u></p>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<a href="#"><u>be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></a>	
FS17.179	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.159	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.
OS85.10	Metlifecare Limited	Not Stated	The Medium Density Residential zone provisions should provide for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity.	<p>As currently drafted the construction of a retirement village would also require resource consent (under the general building / structure rules in the High Density and Medium Density Residential zones). The Proposed Plan provides that "all buildings and structures" that infringe one or more of the built form standards (i.e. buildings with greater than three units) are a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion relate to the specific standards that are not met. For example, for more than three units, the matter of discretion is consistency with the Residential Design Guide.</p> <p>Generally supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments.</p>

				<p>It also supports that the rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>However not all of the standards that relate to the construction of buildings and structures are applicable to retirement village development. For example, outdoor living space (per unit) and outlook space (per unit) requirements should not apply to retirement village development as these types of developments are designed for older residents and generally have communal outdoor spaces (which are maintained by the village provider) rather than individual backyard or outdoor living areas that would need to be maintained by the residents. There are also a range of housing typologies within a retirement village including dementia care units where the provision of outlook space should not unnecessarily constrain the design of these care facilities. The relevant matters of discretion are the general residential policies for all residential zones (not including the retirement village specific policy). These do not refer to retirement villages or the policy applicable to retirement villages and do not recognise the specific functional and operational needs of retirement village development.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.447	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.39	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Retirement villages need to be provided for as a residential activity and enabled as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rule that permits the use and operation of retirement villages, recognising that this activity is expected and encouraged in residential zones;</li> <li>• A rule that regulates the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, recognising that this activity is anticipated in residential zones with limited matters requiring assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>Retirement villages are required to be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS as they require “the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site”. The Variation includes Rules HRZ-R19 and MRZ-R22, which regulate retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The restricted discretionary status is inappropriate as it does not recognise that retirement villages are an appropriate activity in residential zones. Therefore seeks a permitted activity rule for the use and operation of retirement villages (consistent with HRZ-R5 and MRZ-R5 for other residential activity). The Variation regulates the construction of retirement villages under Rules HRZ-R1 and MRZ-R1. Supports the restricted discretionary activity status that would apply to retirement villages under these rules (being four or more</p>

				residential units on a site), but opposes the matters of discretion.
FS67.41	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS75.15	Roger Gadd	Support	Exclude the faded text from the District Plan, Specifically the old MRZO1, MRZ-O2, old MRZ-PREC02-01, old MRZ-PREC02-02, and old MRZ-PREC02-03.	The dark text proposed in the 2022 draft is more succinct, more relevant to the rest of the 2022 proposed plan, and better worded.
FS17.666	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS88.1	Nash Alexander	Support	In regard to MRZ-O2, the requirement for open space needs to ensure that buildings are adequately angled to make the most of sun planes. Neighbours who live immediately adjacent to proposed 2 or 3 storey buildings <b>must</b> be able to get informed of any proposal to build high properties so that they are able to have input into the final decision.	Intensity is not good when it is not done well. Immediately adjacent neighbours will have more realistic knowledge of sun planes, intensity, etc, than an Auckland based architect who only looks at google earth and plans a house design that does not at all follow the sun.
FS17.454	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

# 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.1-MRZ-O1 Planned urban built environment of the Medium Density Residential Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.18	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain MRZ-O1	The general intent of Objective MRZ-O1 is supported, noting that clauses 2 and 3 of the objective reference health, wellbeing and safety. Specific to the National Grid, the avoidance of sensitive activities within the defined National Grid Yard helps to achieve a safe urban environment. Notes that the infrastructure chapter objectives and policies also apply to residential activities (where relevant). They provide greater context and policy consideration for the appropriateness of activities.
FS17.629	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS69.2	Michelle Smart	Oppose	Delete	Pressure on infrastructure, destruction of natural environment and greenspaces, increased flooding and slips, increased shading, special character erosion, lack of social services and amenities, poor access to public transport.  The northern suburbs of Porirua have high visitor attraction, being seaside villages. Even medium density housing will destroy



				<p>the character and appeal of the area. High rates are paid for the special character and properties have high land values due to the location.</p> <p>There is no ability to increase greenspaces, public amenities and social services. The services currently available are already [under] immense pressure or are unable to cope.</p>
FS17.289	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS70.1	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	<p>Remove the reference to <b>predominantly 3-storey buildings</b> and replace with more appropriate wording (such as the Medium Density description in Plimmerton Farm Plan Change 19). The following is preferred:</p> <p><b>“a planned form providing a variety of housing types and sizes and enabling the development of buildings up to 3-storeys”.</b></p>	<p>Existing built areas are currently predominantly single and 2-storey buildings. The intent of Part 2, Schedule 3A of the RMA is to <b>ENABLE</b> 3-storey buildings. It does not mean housing is required to be 3-storeys (which this description implies), even for greenfield and brownfield developments.</p> <p>This also conflicts with wording of RESZ-P1</p>
FS17.290	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.152	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
OS75.2	Roger Gadd	Support	Not applicable.	The objective as defined is reasonable and consistent with Government legislation.
FS17.653	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS76.167	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective, which clearly sets out the planned urban built environment of the MRZ.
FS17.835	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.200	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.174	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS89.2	Elijah Smart	Oppose	Delete	Pressure on infrastructure, destruction of natural environment and greenspaces, increased flooding and slips, increased shading, special character erosion, lack of

				<p>social services and amenities, poor access to public transport.</p> <p>The northern suburbs of Porirua have high visitor attraction, being seaside villages. Even medium density housing will destroy the character and appeal of the area. We pay high rates for the special character and our properties have high land values due to the location.</p> <p>There is no ability to increase greenspaces, public amenities and social services. The services currently available are already immense pressure or are unable to cope.</p>
FS17.462	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS92.5	Ministry of Education	Amend	<p>MRZ-O1- Planned urban environment of the Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>3. An urban environment that is visually attractive, safe, easy to navigate, and convenient to access, <u>including existing and planned educational facilities.</u></p> <p>Any supporting policies associated with MRZ-O1 should be amended to reflect the Ministry's outlined relief and any consequential amendments.</p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
OS118.92	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Delete MRZ-O1 and replace with an objective that reflects Objective 2 of the MDRS.	Oppose MRZ-O1 as it seeks to provide for amenity outcomes in the Medium Density Residential Zone that go beyond what is set out in the MDRS and the objectives and

				policies that apply to all residential zones. Matters relating to integration into public and private open space, on-site and off-site amenity and visual attractiveness are not necessarily in the ambit of control of the Council in light of the built form standards that apply in the zone.
FS67.94	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.2-MRZ-PREC02-O1 Planned urban built environment of the MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.37	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports MRZ-PREC02-O1 insofar as it promotes a planned built environment within the medium density residential zone which provides for the well-being of people residing in the precinct.
FS17.170	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS70.3	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	Modify the existing description with more appropriate wording such as:  "A planned built form providing a variety of housing types and sizes, including terraced housing and apartment buildings up to four and five storeys in height".	The intensification potential can be more readily achieved in greenfield and brownfield developments but is less likely to be the case in existing built-up areas identified as MRZ- Residential Intensification. Again, the wording implies that only higher rise terraced housing and apartments can be built. The wording needs

				modification to identify that the <b>zone ENABLES such development but doesn't require it.</b>
FS17.292	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS75.4	Roger Gadd	Amend	Amend subclause 1. To read "A planned built form of terraced housing and apartments buildings, which are predominantly four and five storeys in Height, but where the increment in height between adjacent sites will not exceed two storeys"	For a single storey dwelling, an adjacent building of more than 3 storeys is likely to cause environmental problems.
FS17.655	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.168	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective and the proposed MRZ-Residential Intensification Precinct.
FS17.836	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.201	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.175	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.26	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	<p>MRZ-PREC01-O2 is not clear, in the sense that the 'how' is missing.</p> <p>In the same regard, MRZ-PREC01-O1 is not clear as it asks for a planned built form with four and five storeys, a greater intensity of buildings than normally seen in the Medium Density Residential Zone and a quality of built environment that provides for the health and well-being of people residing in the Precinct. These concepts are not mutually exclusive; they are subjective.</p> <p>These objectives can be improved by including 'by way of'.</p>	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.554	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.417	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.93	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amend MRZ-PREC02-O1 for alignment with the new MRZ-O1 as sought [in separate submission point].	Supports the provision for greater intensity in this precinct, but is concerned the differences between these objectives and

			[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	MRZ-O1 are likely to result in interpretation issues.
FS67.95	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.3-MRZ-PREC02-O2 Managing scale of development at MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct Interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS70.4	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	Modify wording to provide protection to mitigate against adverse effects on the health and well-being of persons residing <u>both within and outside</u> the Precinct.	Protecting the health and well-being of all residents is important. The impact of form, design and scale of development should apply whether the impact is felt within or outside the Intensification Precinct.
FS17.293	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS75.3	Roger Gadd	Amend	Delete the words "located outside of the Precinct".	Mitigating adverse effects on the health and well-being of people residing within the precinct must also be an objective.
FS17.654	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.169	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<i>Amendments sought</i>  <del>Use and Built</del> development within the MRZ-Residential Intensification Precinct is of <del>a form, design and scale that an appropriate scale and proportion for the planned urban</del>	Generally supports this objective but seeks some amendments to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought by the provision that is managing effects at the interface outside of the precinct.

			<u>built environment of the precinct and effectively minimises adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in the Medium Density Residential Zone</u> <del>mitigate adverse effects on the health and well-being of people residing in adjacent sites</del> located outside of the Precinct.	
FS17.837	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.202	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.176	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.



OS88.2	Nash Alexander	Oppose	Opposed to greater intensification in Eastern Porirua.	The infrastructure network is crumbling. Footpaths are in sore need of renewal. Intensification of Eastern Porirua without addressing the core fundamentals before overloading infrastructure even further should not be done.
FS17.455	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS114.25	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	MRZ-PREC01-O2 is not clear, in the sense that the 'how' is missing.  In the same regard, MRZ-PREC01-O1 is not clear as it asks for a planned built form with four and five storeys, a greater intensity of buildings than normally seen in the Medium Density Residential Zone and a quality of built environment that provides for the health and well-being of people residing in the Precinct. These concepts are not mutually exclusive; they are subjective.  These objectives can be improved by including 'by way of'.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.553	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.416	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.94	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amend MRZ-PREC02-O2 for alignment with the new MRZ-O1 as sought [in separate submission point].  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Supports the provision for greater intensity in this precinct, but is concerned the differences between these objectives and MRZ-O1 are likely to result in interpretation issues.

FS67.96	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
---------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.3-Objective > 13.3.4-MRZ-PREC03-O1 Recognition of development constraints of natural environmental overlays in the Takapūwāhia Precinct

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.170	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective.
FS17.838	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.203	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.177	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.19	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the introductory text to the rules within the MRZ chapter.	Supports reference to the infrastructure chapter objectives and policies as such reference will assist in plan interpretation and application.
FS17.630	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS75.16	Roger Gadd	Support	Exclude the faded text from the District Plan.	The dark text proposed in the 2022 draft is more succinct, more relevant to the rest of the 2022 proposed plan, and better worded. There are various Rules in the faded text that I would have specifically objected to were it proposed to include them in the District Plan.
FS17.667	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS104.6	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	The scale of commercial activities that are permitted in these zones should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

FS17.502	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
----------	-----------------	---------	---	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.1-MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.20	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>Amend Rule MRZ-R1 as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><i>Notification:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MRZ-S1, MRZ-S7, or MRZ-S8 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</i></li> <li>• <i>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6 or MRZS6S9 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Supports MRZ-O1 on the basis the National Grid is identified as a qualifying matter and for sites subject to rule MRZ-R16 (i.e., being with the National Grid Yard) the rules and standards of the Operative District Plan will apply until the Proposed District Plan including Variation 1 has legal effect.</p> <p>Amendment is sought to the rule in the form of a note to clarify for plan users that activities subject to the rule are subject to the qualifying matter area provisions to assist with plan interpretation and application.</p>

			<i>Note: Activities subject to MRZ-R1 shall comply with, and are subject to, the relevant provisions for qualifying matter areas.</i>	
FS17.631	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.15	KiwiRail	Support	Adopt amendment sought in submission.	KiwiRail agrees that the note sought by Transpower would assist with plan interpretation and application in that it clarifies for plan users that rules may be notified in areas where a qualifying matter applies, such as the rail corridor.
FS73.22	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Accept the submission.	Support the submission and agree that the note requested would assist with plan interpretation and application.
FS76.367	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes this amendment, as it is not considered to be necessary to aid in interpretation and implementation of the Plan.
OS118.96	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Seeks that MRZ-R1 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:  <b>MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls</b> a. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b> .... b. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where: c. Compliance is not achieved with <del>MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6,</del>	To provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.  Supports MRZ-R1 and the permitting of buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. Retirement villages will likely infringe the number of residential units per site standard (MRZ-S1), so the construction of retirement villages will be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. The construction of

		<p><del>MRZ S7, MRZ S8 or MRZ S9</del> <u>MRZ-R1(1)(a)</u>. Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>d. <u>The effects of the breach of any infringed standards.</u></p> <p>e. <u>Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></u> <u>Where:</u></p> <p>f. <u>Compliance is not achieved with <u>MRZ-R1(1)(a)</u>; and</u></p> <p>g. <u>The application is for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p>h. <u>The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u></p> <p>i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>j. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p>k. <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p>l. <u>When assessing the matters in 1 - 5, consider:</u></p> <p>m. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p>n. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>o. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement</u></p>	<p>retirement villages should have a focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). Retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity, and that it should instead only be the construction of the retirement village that is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. When considering the matters of discretion that are currently applicable to retirement villages under MRZ-R22 (being RESZ-P13), additional provision / recognition is required for the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents. The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><u>village.</u>  <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><b>Notification:</b>  p. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MRZ-S1, MRZ-S7 or MRZ-S8 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.  q. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6 or MRZ-S9 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</p> <p>r. <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>  s. <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village where compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	
FS67.98	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.1-MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 13.4.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.40	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  ...  <i>MRZ-SX is complied with.</i>	Seeks an objective, policy and rule framework within the Medium Density Residential Zone that ensures activities are adequately serviced with water supply or other method for firefighting purposes. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.173	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.158	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.



# 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.1-MRZ-R1 Buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, but excluding fences and stand-alone walls > 13.4.1.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.171	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Change non-notification clause associated with MRZ-R1(2):</p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <a href="#">MRZ-S1</a>, <a href="#">MRZ-S6</a>, <a href="#">MRZ-S7</a>, <del>or</del> <a href="#">MRZ-S8</a> <del>of</del> <a href="#">MRZ-S9</a> is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</li> <li>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <a href="#">MRZ-S3</a>, <a href="#">MRZ-S4</a>, <del>or</del> <a href="#">MRZ-S5</a>, <del>MRZ-S6</del> <del>or</del> <a href="#">MRZ-S9</a> is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</li> </ul>	Generally supports this rule. Changes are sought to preclude MRZ-S6 and MRZ-S9 – i.e., a breach to the landscaping and windows to street standards from limited notification.
FS17.839	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.204	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.189	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	The RVA seeks to have their original submission point included and to disallow this point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission with respect to how notification should be applied to retirement villages.
FS122.2	Survey & Spatial New Zealand - Wellington Branch	Support	Submitter requests that the submission to include MRZ-S6 and MRZ-S9 in the public and limited notification preclusion statement is allowed.	Non-compliance with landscaping and front windows should not be subject to limited notification to neighbours – this is a design matter
FS127.178	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.2-MRZ-R2 Construction activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.172	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  MRZ-R2  Construction <u>and demolition</u> activity.	Supports this permitted activity rule in general but seeks amendment to the chapeau of the rule to make it clear that demolition is also a permitted activity.
FS17.840	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.205	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.179	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.3-MRZ-R3 Rainwater tank

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.173	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.841	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.206	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.180	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.4-MRZ-R4 Fences and stand-alone walls

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.174	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.842	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.207	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.181	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.5-MRZ-R5 Residential activity, excluding papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.175	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.843	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.208	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.182	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.6-MRZ-R6 Conservation activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.176	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.844	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.209	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.183	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.7-MRZ-R7 Customary harvesting

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.177	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.845	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.210	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the



				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.184	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.8-MRZ-R8 Sport and recreation facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.178	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this rule.
FS17.846	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.211	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.185	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.9-MRZ-R9 Supported residential care activity > 13.4.9.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.179	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<i>Amendments sought</i>  1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b>  Where:	Supports the permitted activity status of this activity but seeks that the number of residents is increased from six to ten. Notes such a change is consistent with other planning documents in the region, such as Wellington City's PDP.

			The maximum occupancy does not exceed <del>six</del> <u>ten</u> residents.	
FS17.847	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.212	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.186	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.9-MRZ-R9 Supported residential care activity > 13.4.9.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.190	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<b>Notification:</b>  An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved is precluded from being publicly <b>or limited</b> notified in accordance with sections <b>95A and 95B</b> of the RMA.	Seeks preclusion to limited notification in the event this threshold is breached.
FS17.858	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.223	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.197	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.10-MRZ-R10 Home business

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS75.5	Roger Gadd	Amend	Amend subclause a. to read something like "No more than 40m2 of total gross floor area of each dwelling and its associated buildings on site is used for the home business"	Whether this amendment is necessary depends on several legal definitions. Submitter proposes this change because they consider it might prevent the occupants of a residence taking a property right from the occupants of other residences on the same site. For example, where occupant 1 uses 80m2 of her dwelling for business use, but this still equates to only 40m2 per dwelling, the occupant of the other dwelling on site would be prohibited from operating a home business.
FS17.656	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.180	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Support this rule.

FS17.848	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.213	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.187	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.11-MRZ-R11 Educational facility, including home-based childcare services

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.181	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.849	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.214	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.188	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.12-MRZ-R12 Visitor accommodation

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.182	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.850	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.215	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people



FS127.189	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.13-MRZ-R13 Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS35.1	Te Whenua Ora Trust (formerly Te Hiko Puaha Trust)	Amend	<p>Include the following as eligible types of land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Title, but was Māori Freehold Title prior to compulsory acquisition by the Crown or a council; or converted from Māori Freehold Title to General Title under the Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1967</li> <li>• General Title and was transferred from the Crown as part of a Treaty Settlement Act</li> <li>• General Title and collectively owned by Māori, represented by certain organisations</li> </ul>	<p>Including these land types ensures Māori landowners are recognised and treated in the same manner as those whose whenua is titled under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, particularly for those whose whenua was taken by the Crown.</p> <p>This aligns with the Greater Wellington Regional Council's eligibility types in relation to land under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, as stated in their Rates Remission Policy.</p> <p>Recognising Māori owned land not titled under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, as an eligible land type, is also seen favourably by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.</p>

FS17.84	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS35.2	Te Whenua Ora Trust (formerly Te Hiko Puaha Trust)	Amend	Change the gross floor area of all commercial activities to be measured by a percentage of the site, rather than a specific square meterage. For example, 15% of the site.	This allows the commercial prospects to be relative to the land mass and residential potential, providing appropriate community support.
FS17.85	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS35.3	Te Whenua Ora Trust (formerly Te Hiko Puaha Trust)	Amend	Change the gross floor area of all community activities to be measured by a percentage of the site, rather than a specific square meterage.	This allows the community activities to be relative to the site and residential potential, providing appropriate community support.
FS17.86	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.183	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.851	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.216	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.190	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.27	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Minimum Gross floor area for commercial activities is ringfenced as 100 square meters and for community facilities it is 200 square meters. Gross floor areas should be increased for those activities and as reiterated up in the comments, this information needs to be consistent across the chapter zones. Te Rūnanga are unsure as to the Standards of Medium Density Residential Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	A significant concern is again regarding the Papakāinga rule in the Medium Density Residential Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.555	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.418	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.14-MRZ-R14 Show home

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.184	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.852	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.217	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.191	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.15-MRZ-R15 Community garden

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.191	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.859	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.224	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.198	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.16-MRZ-R16 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.21	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	MRZ-R16 be retained as notified, subject to amendment to the National Grid Yard rules as sought in the submitter's submission to the PDP and evidence presented at hearings.	<p>The wording within Variation 1 MRZ-R16 reflects the wording of the PDP GRZ-R5 which is proposed to be deleted in Variation 1 given the GRZ is to be deleted and replaced with the MRZ. The submitter made a number of submission points, including on GRZ-R5. Evidence was also provided at Hearing Stream 4. The relief sought through its submission and hearing evidence stands. Notwithstanding the amendments sought, for the reasons provided in the upfront reasoning to this submission and the assessment provided. Supports MRZ-R16 on the basis the rule which essentially makes new (or extensions to) buildings or structures for a sensitive (residential) activity a noncomplying activity. As defined by section 77I and 77O of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD);</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure;</li> <li>• Provisions that restrict development in relation to the National Grid are included in the Operative District Plan; and</li> <li>• Provisions that would protect the National Grid from inappropriate subdivision, use and development that would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS are included in the proposed district plan.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed rule MRZ-R16 (and R17 relating to activities within the National Grid Yard) reflects the non-complying activity status both within the Operative District Plan and the PDP (August 2020) for new building and structures for sensitive activities within the defined (12 metre wide as measured from the centreline and foundations of support structures) National Grid Yard.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.632	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.368	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora does not support changes to MRZ-R16 as sought by the submitter. Rule MRZ-R16 replaces GRZ-R5, the substance of which was considered through Hearing Stream 5. Kāinga

				Ora acknowledges the s42A recommendations regarding submissions on this rule within Hearing Stream 5. No further consideration of this rule (restated as Rule MRZ-R16) is considered necessary.
OS76.185	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.853	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.218	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.192	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.



## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.17-MRZ-R17 Activities within the National Grid Yard

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.22	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	MRZ-R17 be retained as notified, subject to amendment to the National Grid Yard rules as sought in the submitter's submission to the PDP and evidence presented at hearings (in particular Hearing Stream 4.	The wording within Variation 1 MRZ-R17 reflects the wording of the PDP GRZ-R14 which is proposed to be deleted in Variation 1 given the GRZ is to be deleted and replaced with the MRZ. The submitter made a number of submission points on the PDP including on GRZ-R14. Evidence was also provided at Hearing Stream 4. The relief sought through its submission and hearing evidence stands.
FS17.633	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.369	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora acknowledges the s42A recommendations regarding submissions on this rule within Hearing Stream 5. No further consideration of this rule (restated as Rule MRZ-R17) is considered necessary.
OS76.186	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Support this rule.
FS17.854	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.219	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.193	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.18-MRZ-R18 Activities within the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.187	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.855	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.220	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.194	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.19-MRZ-R19 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.41	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Notes that rule allows the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes

				and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.174	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.188	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.856	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.221	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.195	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.20-MRZ-R20 Community facility, excluding healthcare activities and hospitals

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.189	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Support this rule.
FS17.857	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.222	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.196	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.21-MRZ-R21 Healthcare activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.192	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this rule.
FS17.860	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.225	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.199	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.22-MRZ-R22 Retirement village

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.193	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.861	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.226	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.190	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	The RVA seeks to have their original submission point included (providing for retirement villages as a use as a permitted activity) and to disallow this point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.200	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS85.6	Metlifecare Limited	Amend	Seeks that rule MRZ-R22 be amended to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity.	<p>Rule MRZ-R22 provides that retirement villages are a restricted discretionary activity in the Medium Density Residential zones, with matters of discretion being those set out in RESZ-P13. It is appropriate to recognise and enable retirement village use as permitted in residential zones. Proposes that RESZ-P13 remains relevant to the construction of a retirement village as a restricted discretionary activity, meaning that the applicant will still need to address these matters for a new retirement village development.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA;</p>



				(e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.443	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.97	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity (with the construction of a retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R1).  <b>MRZ-R22 Retirement village</b> 1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del> <b>Permitted</b> <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> <del>1. The matters in RESZ-P13.</del> <del>Notification:</del> <del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</del>	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. Retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.
FS67.99	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.23-MRZ-R23 Commercial activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.195	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.863	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.228	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.202	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS104.5	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Small-scale commercial activity should be controlled or permitted or restricted discretionary, rather than the proposed discretionary.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

FS17.501	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
----------	-----------------	---------	---	---

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.24-MRZ-R24 Any activity not listed as a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.194	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.862	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.227	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is

				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.201	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.25-MRZ-R25 Industrial activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.196	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this rule.
FS17.864	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.229	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.203	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.26-MRZ-R26 Rural industry

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.197	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.865	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.230	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude

				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.204	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.27-MRZ-R27 Hospital

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.198	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.866	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.231	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.205	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.4-Rules > 13.4.28-MRZ-R28 Primary production

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.199	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule.
FS17.867	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.232	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has

			proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.206	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS75.17	Roger Gadd	Support	Exclude the faded text from the District Plan.	There were a number of anomalies, ambiguities, and unnecessary Standards in the original proposal. The Standards as proposed in the new darker text generally address these and better enable compliance while meeting the Objectives.
FS17.668	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS88.5	Nash Alexander	Oppose	Public reserves should be subject to a homeowner being able to fence off their	There is no sound reason why a homeowner who's property backs onto a reserve should



			property to a maximum of 2m in height for safety and security reasons.	be limited from ensuring safety and security all around their property.  If for example, a property owner has a dog, a fence that is 1.2m high can easily be cleared by many breeds of dogs. This will cause issues for reserve users if a dog escapes. Private property boundaries should be allowed to be fully fenced with the maximum height fences allowed before consent is required (being 2 m)
FS17.458	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS104.2	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Building height limits and recession planes and setbacks consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.498	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS104.3	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Add a permeability standard, such as that minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (incl permeable pavers / gravel etc).	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.499	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS112.5	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	That reference be provided in the MRZ Standards to the effect that discretion can be applied to the matters in INF-P5.	The VA1 Rule preamble states "The Infrastructure chapter contains objectives and policies relevant to activities in proximity of regionally significant infrastructure.". Upon review of the Infrastructure Chapter it is further noted

				that only subdivision objective and policy matters are addressed – not land use. [With reference to INF-P5] discretion can therefore consider the actual and/or potential effects of reverse sensitivity.
FS76.398	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes this relief, noting that the presence of infrastructure in proximity to residential areas enabled for intensification does not, in and of itself, present a reverse sensitivity effect warranting additional controls or management

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.1-MRZ-S1 Number of residential units per site

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.200	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p><i>MRZ-S1 - Number of residential units per site</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There must be no more than 3 residential units per site; <b>and</b></li> <li>2. <b><u>Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u></b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b><u>MRZ-S2 – height</u></b></li> <li>ii. <b><u>MRZ-S3 - HIRTB;</u></b></li> <li>iii. <b><u>HRZ-S4 – building coverage</u></b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Supports this standard in part and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Also seeks additional matters of discretion

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. <u>HRZ-S5 - only in relation to the rear/side yard boundary setback;</u></li> <li>v. <u>HRZ-S8– outlook space.</u></li> </ul> <p>3. <u>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>i. Where compliance with MRZ-S1(1.) cannot be achieved.</u></p> <ul 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; and</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.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>ii. Where compliance with MRZ-S1(2.) cannot be achieved:</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><u>5. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. An application for resource consent which complies with MRZ-S1(1.) but does not comply with MRZ-S1(2.) is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></li> <li><u>2. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with MRZ-S1(1.) but complies with MRZ-S1(2.) is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></li> <li><u>3. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with MRZ-S1(1.) and MRZ-S1(2.) but complies with MRZ-S2 height and MRZ-S4 – building coverage is precluded from being either publicly notified.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.868	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.233	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS122.3	Survey & Spatial New Zealand - Wellington Branch	Oppose	Submitter requests that the addition to MRZ-S1 is disallowed.	The MDRS standards cannot be amended or added to. The submission appears to be related to MRZ-R1.
FS127.207	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.201	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend notification:  <u>Notification status:</u>  1. <u>An application for resource consent which complies with MRZ-S1(1.) but does not comply with MRZ-S1(2.) is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>  2. <u>An application for resource consent made which does not comply with MRZ-S1(1.) but complies with MRZ-</u>	Seeks non-notification clauses to provide clarity.

			<p><u>S1(2.) is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p> <p>3. <u>An application for resource consent made which does not comply with MRZ-S1(1.) and MRZ-S1(2.) but complies with MRZ-S2 height and MRZ-S4 – building coverage is precluded from being either publicly notified.</u></p>	
FS17.869	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.234	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.208	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.22	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the implementation of the density standards in accordance with the NPS-UD and the MDRS standards.
FS17.1056	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS114.28	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	MRZ-S1 specifies the 'Number of residential units per site' and how this standard interacts with Papakāinga developments and whether this has negative impact on how Te Rūnanga might want to implement their rights and interests.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.556	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.419	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.98	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend MRZ-S1 to refer to retirement units. Seeks [in separate submission point] the phrasing of RESZ-P10 (being a matter of discretion applicable to MRZ-S1) to be amended.	Supports MRZ-S1 and the number of residential units per site provisions which reflect the number of residential units per site standard of the MDRS. However, it will need to be amended to refer to "retirement units" with the addition of the definition proposed. The inclusion of 'the matters of RESZ-P10' as matters of discretion (being a demonstration that a development is consistent with the Residential Design Guide) is not appropriate for retirement villages. The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and provides no guidance as to why

				the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with a substantially differing functional and operational needs).
FS67.100	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.2-MRZ-S2 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS4.2	Philippa Sargent	Support	Retain and strictly enforce this SASM height control for all the properties which have it assigned to them.	This SASM height control is reasonable for areas of cultural significance. It respects the value of these locations, not just for tangata whenua but for the wider community. It helps ensure built structures do not completely dominate these culturally important areas.
FS17.12	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS26.1	Kevin Clark	Oppose	Does not support 14m height limit. Supports maintaining the present height limits, which generally limit dwellings to two stories.	The concept of three three story dwellings crammed on to one typical residential site is absurd. To increase the density, three units on one site might be manageable but the height limits should remain as at present, generally limiting dwellings to two stories.



				<p>Fears for the squalid results that this new approach will produce. Planning medium and high density housing developments requires a high level of skill and experience, and unfortunately in New Zealand much of this development will be carried out by speculative developers and designers inexperienced in this work, and particularly the social and amenity aspects. This will result in slum-like conditions, where daylight, privacy and general living amenities will be sub standard.</p> <p>The early British settlers, and the more recent settlers from Asia, came here to get away from high density housing with its uncomfortable cramped and dingy living conditions. Why re-create this? There have been many failures with type of development, and social problems continue in Europe and other parts of the world. Extreme care is needed.</p> <p>There are examples of two-storied multi-unit developments under construction in Grays road in Plimmerton, without the need to build up to three stories.</p>
FS17.47	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS31.2	Warrick Procter	Oppose	Retain the existing height control.	Medium density housing, in particular buildings that have more than two storeys are completely out of character for the area.

				<p>Moana Road is a picturesque part of Plimmerton and high-rise building will have a significant impact on the areas aesthetic value.</p> <p>High-rise building will also cause unnecessary, unwanted shading of adjoining dwellings. This issue has already caused a great deal of concern and animosity in the area.</p> <p>The lower (western) areas of 4 Moana Road, Plimmerton are reclaimed beach and are largely sand. These areas will be significantly destabilised in the event of flooding and, in particular impending sea-level rise which is expected to eventually inundate the property. The upper (eastern) areas of the property are unstable and have had significant land-slippage in recent times. Water and sediment has affected the lower (western) areas of the property.</p>
FS17.54	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.43	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to:</i></p> <p>...</p>	<p>Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone.</p>

			<u><i>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i></u>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  Seeks an exclusion from MRZ-S2 and MRZ-S3 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers
FS17.176	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.14	Radio New Zealand Limited	Amend	1. Buildings and structures must not exceed a height of: a. ... i. <u>10m on sites subject to Height Control – Radiocommunication Transmission, as identified on the planning maps.</u>  Matters of discretion restricted to: ... 1. <u>The matters in REZ-PX Height Control – Radiocommunication Transmission.</u>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.323	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.383	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter and resulting changes sought to the MDRS and proposed new matter of discretion. Kāinga Ora does not consider the submitter has provided adequate reasoning to demonstrate why a 1m reduction from 11m to 10m within 528m of the Porirua Site is necessary to manage the stated effect(s).

OS75.6	Roger Gadd	Amend	<p>Amend sub-clauses b. and c. to limit the height of any building so that its tallest point is also no more than 8m higher (above sea level) than the highest point of the buildings on the neighbouring properties unless each neighbour whose building is more than 8m below the height of the proposed building grants their consent. (This height difference is height above sea level, not each individual building's height above its ground level).</p>	<p>Submitter notes that an 18m height limit is more than sufficient to construct a six-storey building.</p> <p>The amendment proposed would provide for a more graduated cityscape and would provide the opportunity for property owners who are disadvantaged by a tall building constructed next to them to gain compensation. If enacted, this proposed amendment would usually only have an effect where the buildings are on a hillside. Where a neighbouring site is vacant, an 11m height limit should apply unless consent from the existing neighbour is received. Such a standard should also take into account the distance of the neighbouring dwelling from the shared boundary.</p> <p>Submitter would prefer that the height limit be 11m throughout MRZ, but suggest this amendment as a compromise.</p>
FS17.657	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
OS76.202	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed a height of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 11m;</li> <li>2. 18m in the MRZ-Residential Intensification Precinct;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Supports the following aspects of this standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MDRS of 11m</li> <li>• MRZ-RIP of 18m</li> </ul>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <del>14m on sites subject to Height Control – Shading B as identified on the planning maps;</del></li> <li>4. <del>9m on sites subject to Height Control – Shading C as identified on the planning maps;</del></li> <li>5. 8m on sites subject to Height Control – Shading D as identified on the planning maps;</li> <li>6. <del>11m on sites subject to Height Control – Heritage A as identified on the planning maps;</del></li> <li>7. <del>8m on sites subject to Height Control – Heritage C, as identified on the planning maps; and</del></li> <li>8. <del>8m on sites subject to Height Control – SASM as identified on the planning maps.</del></li> </ol>	<p>Does not support the introduction of qualifying matter restricting height to manage effects of shading upon residential sites in areas with steep south facing topography (Height Control – Shading B, and Height Control – Shading C). Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.</p> <p>Also does not support the application of height controls on sites that adjoin identified heritage or sites of significance to Māori. Instead, supports the use of HIRB on boundaries adjoining sites with identified values. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.</p>
FS17.870	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.124	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified

				development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS74.132	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that controls on height to protect sites of significance Māori are retained as notified except as requested in the original submission.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting the controls restricting building heights on sites adjacent to sites of significance to Māori. This would not give effect to the Operative RPS or have regard to Proposed Change 1 to the RPS. It is noted that Greater Wellington's original submission supported including a new qualifying matter to require setbacks from sites of significance to Māori in conjunction with restrictions on height and height in relation to boundaries.
FS99.235	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.74	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the deletion of height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori disallowed.	We oppose the deletion of additional height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori because these

				controls would protect sites of significance from adverse effects of development.
FS127.209	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.203	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Consequential deletion of matters of discretion that refer to policies relevant to the matters being deleted [height controls for shading].	Does not support the introduction of qualifying matter restricting height to manage effects of shading upon residential sites in areas with steep south facing topography (Height Control – Shading B, and Height Control – Shading C). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.
FS17.871	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.236	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.210	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.204	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter. [Height Control – Shading B, and Height Control – Shading C].	Does not support the introduction of qualifying matter restricting height to manage effects of shading upon residential sites in areas with steep south facing topography (Height Control – Shading B, and Height Control – Shading C). Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.
FS17.872	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.125	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.



FS99.237	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.211	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.205	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter [height controls on sites that adjoin identified heritage or sites of significance to Māori].	Does not support the application of height controls on sites that adjoin identified heritage or sites of significance to Māori. Instead, supports the use of HIRB on boundaries adjoining sites with identified values. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.
FS17.873	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS74.133	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that controls on height to protect sites of significance Māori are retained as notified except as requested in the original submission.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting the controls restricting building heights on sites adjacent to sites of significance to Māori. This would not give effect to the Operative RPS or have regard to Proposed Change 1 to the RPS. It is noted that Greater Wellington's original submission supported including a new qualifying matter to require setbacks from sites of significance to Māori in conjunction with restrictions on height and height in relation to boundaries.
FS99.238	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.75	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that the deletion of height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori disallowed.	We oppose the deletion of additional height controls on sites adjoining sites of significance to Māori because these controls would protect sites of significance from adverse effects of development.

FS127.212	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.206	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Consequential changes to the name and label of the Height Control – Shading Area will be required.	Does not support the introduction of qualifying matter restricting height to manage effects of shading upon residential sites in areas with steep south facing topography (Height Control – Shading B, and Height Control – Shading C). Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter.
FS17.874	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.118	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.239	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.213	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.23	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the maximum height for buildings located within the Medium Residential Zone and Medium Residential Intensification Zone as this is in accordance with the requirements of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1057	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS118.99	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the height breach or the planned urban built form of the zone.	Supports MRZ-S2 and the height provisions which reflect MDRS with some additional / alternative height provisions for specific areas in the district. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P7 and P8 which are opposed.
FS67.101	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.3-MRZ-S3 Height in relation to boundary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.44	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <u><i>x. Emergency service facilities up to 9m in height and hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i></u>	Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone.  Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from MRZ-S2 and MRZ-S3 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers
FS17.177	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS64.1	Brian Warburton	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Variation 1 does not include details of the recession plane that would apply to buildings on a rear site in the MRZ – Residential Intensification Precinct where the boundary is common between the rear site and a front site. This is depicted in the diagram below [refer to original submission]. There is no definition to differentiate between front and rear sites, no definition of yard (rear, front or side), and no definition that differentiates between boundaries of a site. This makes

				<p>defining and enforcing provisions relating to boundaries particularly difficult. The boundary marked in the following image [refer to original submission] , and the corresponding HIRB relative to it, is not described sufficiently in the PDP or Variation 1.</p> <p>Council Officers’ Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation 1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. Officers claim a clarifying amendment has been made. If an amendment has been made it doesn’t provide any clarification.</p> <p>The standard (as per the draft and notified versions of Variation 1) reads as follows [refer to original submission].</p> <p>For all intents and purposes the outcomes are the same – uncertainty about under what circumstances the bulk and location standards apply. For the boundary-coloured blue in the image below [refer to original submission] MRZ-S3 doesn’t apply because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the boundary is not further than 20m from the road and</li> <li>• it is not a side boundary.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>The PDP/Variation 1 does not differentiate between rear and front sites, the PDP/Variation 1 has no definition of yard (rear, front or side), and the PDP/Variation 1 has no provision differentiating between boundaries of a site.</p> <p>This makes defining and enforcing provisions relating to boundaries (eg: the HIRB) particularly difficult, and potentially impossible.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.267	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS75.7	Roger Gadd	Support	Not applicable.	<p>This supports slightly greater housing density in MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct than MRZ.</p> <p>The height near the boundary is sufficiently less than was originally proposed for the MRZ - Residential Intensification Precinct.</p>
FS17.658	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.207	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters in RESZ-P7 <u>and RESZ-P8</u></p>	Generally supports this standard. In particular, supports the additional flexibility that is provided for sites located in the MRZ-RIP. Seeks amendments to further clarify the matters of discretion.

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <u>Building bulk and dominance effects on adjoining properties;</u></li> <li>3. <u>Privacy effects on adjacent residential units, including habitable rooms or outdoor living areas; and</u></li> <li>4. <u>Shading and overshadowing effects on the adjoining properties and the degree of impact on any adjoining internal or external living areas.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.875	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.240	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.214	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been



				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.100	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend HRZ-S3 so that it does not apply to boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones. Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the breach.	Supports MRZ-S3 and the height in relation to boundary provisions which reflect the MDRS. Additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P7 which is opposed.
FS67.102	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.4-MRZ-S4 Building coverage

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.6	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	The landscaped area should be increased to 30% of any site.	Strongly supports the site coverage limit of 50%. This will help reduce the impact of multi storey buildings appearing somewhat randomly in what is otherwise a lower density environment. With no requirement for off street parking there is a risk that there will be too much of a site covered in impermeable surfacing. An increase in the landscaped area is a prudent measure to minimise adverse effects from stormwater run-off. A requirement for any off-street parking areas to be in permeable surfacing would also help and we submit this should be mandated.

FS17.60	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.457	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS32.27	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Strongly supports the site coverage limit of 50%. This will help reduce the impact of multi storey buildings appearing somewhat randomly in what is otherwise a lower density environment. With no requirement for off street parking there is a risk that there will be too much of a site covered in impermeable surfacing. An increase in the landscaped area is a prudent measure to minimise adverse effects from stormwater run-off. A requirement for any off-street parking areas to be in permeable surfacing would also help and we submit this should be mandated.
FS17.81	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.478	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS75.8	Roger Gadd	Support	Perhaps clarify meaning of "net site area".	May need clarification of meaning.
FS17.659	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.208	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Matters of discretion are restricted to:  The matters in <a href="#">RESZ-P7 and</a> RESZ-P8.	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Seeks amendments to further clarify the matters of discretion.

FS17.876	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.241	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.215	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.101	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the building coverage breach on the planned urban built form of the zone.	Supports MRZ-S4 and the building coverage provisions which reflect the MDRS with the additional of some exclusions. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P8 which is opposed.
FS67.103	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.5-MRZ-S5 Setbacks

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS72.5	KiwiRail	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p>2. Buildings and structures must not be located within a <del>1.5m</del> <u>5m</u> setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</p>	<p>The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will:</p> <p>(a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;</p> <p>(b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;</p> <p>(c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district;</p> <p>(d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure;</p> <p>(e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.</p>
FS17.302	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.372	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as the proposed 1.5m set back provides 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.
OS75.9	Roger Gadd	Amend	<p>Amend requirement for “Front” to read “3m, where that the boundary is to a road, otherwise it must be 1m”.</p> <p>(On the understanding that the exclusions at the end of MRZ-S5 apply to both clauses 1. And 2.), Delete from the exclusions “Any part of a building that is 7m or less in length, where this exemption only occurs once per site” and “Eaves up to a maximum of 600mm in width”.</p>	<p>A Front setback of greater than 1.5m is desirable for the urban landscape, the occupants, and for some provision of road widening if deemed necessary in future.</p> <p>Permitting 7m of a building to be adjacent to a road reserve or (unless the neighbours agree) any adjacent property significantly reduces the benefit of this standard.</p> <p>Permitting eaves not to count as part of the building footprint for the purpose of this standard may mean that adjacent buildings on separate sites may have eaves that are only separated by 800mm. The space between those building would be dead space, the eaves would restrict air and light moving into that space, and the eaves may present a fire hazard. The level of light reaching any window on those walls would be significantly degraded, as would the potential for fresh air supply to the occupants.</p>
FS17.660	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.209	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard and the additional flexibility that has been incorporated over and above the MDRS.

FS17.877	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.242	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.216	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS116.4	Frances Dodge	Oppose	Increase the front yard setback back to 5mor at least 3m in all zones.	Plimmerton Farms is not within walking distance to Porirua CBD. There are no local high schools. There is only 1 intermediate school for the entire area which is already at capacity. People will need cars to go to the CBD and to and from school at a minimum given it will almost 100% be outside of the Plimmerton area. Whilst some of Plimmerton Farms is within walkable distance to the train station, you cannot do your weekly

				grocery shop on the train. Kids sports and activities are at all hours of the day and public transport does not suffice. Cars will overrun the streets which are also proposed to be extremely narrow as seen in other developments.
FS17.592	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.102	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Amend the matter of discretion to refer to the effects of the breach.	Supports MRZ-S5 and the setback provisions which reflect the MRS with some additional exclusions. The matter of discretion refers to the RESZ-P7 and P8 which are opposed.
FS67.104	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.6-MRZ-S6 Landscaped area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS75.10	Roger Gadd	Support	Not applicable.	The standard as written provides flexibility while promoting vegetation plantings.
FS17.661	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.210	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters in RESZ-P8.</li> <li>2. <b>How proposed landscaping enhances onsite and/or streetscape</b></li> </ul>	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Seeks amendments to further clarify the matters of discretion.

			<p>amenity;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <u>The appropriateness of any planting (including location, extent, and species selection) to the local climatic environment or the presence of infrastructure;</u></li> <li>4. <u>The extent of tree and garden planting between the building and the road boundary to soften and integrate the development into the surrounding area;</u></li> <li>5. <u>The extent to which the breach is necessary to enable more efficient, cost effective and/or practical use of the remainder of the site; and</u></li> <li>6. <u>Any additional accessibility and safety benefits of providing less landscaped area.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.878	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.243	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions,



				disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.191	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the landscaped area standard of the MDRS.
FS127.217	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.103	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend MRZ-S6 as follows to provide for retirement units:</p> <p><b>MRZ-S6 Landscaped area</b></p> <p>1. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have 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.</p> <p>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 <u>or retirement unit</u>.</p> <p>Amend the matter of discretion to refer to adequate provision of landscaping and planting to meet the needs of the residents.</p>	Supports MRZ-S6 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflect the MDRS, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units. The matter of discretion refers to RESZ-P8 which is opposed.

FS67.105	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
----------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.7-MRZ-S7 Outdoor living space - Per unit

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.211	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters in RESZ-P7;</li> <li>2. <u>The extent to which outdoor living spaces provide useable space, contribute to overall on-site spaciousness, and enable access to sunlight throughout the year for occupants;</u></li> <li>3. <u>The accessibility and connection of the outdoor living space to the internal living area for occupiers of the residential unit(s) that the outdoor living space services;</u></li> <li>4. <u>Whether the size, sunlight access and quality of on-site communal outdoor living space or other open space amenity compensates for any reduction in private outdoor living space;</u></li> </ol>	<p>Supports this standard and the additional flexibility that has been incorporated over and above the MDRS.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to further clarify the matters of discretion.</p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. <u>The extent to which a reduction in outdoor living space will result in retention of mature on-site vegetation;</u></li> <li>6. <u>Proximity of the residential unit to accessible public open space; and</u></li> <li>7. <u>The provision of space for bicycle storage, servicing, washing lines and heat-pump units elsewhere on the site.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.879	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.244	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.192	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with

				the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS.
FS127.218	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS104.4	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Seeks the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space are added.	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.
FS17.500	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.104	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend MRZ-S7 as follows to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard:</p> <p><b>MRZ-S7 Outdoor living space (per unit)</b></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>4. For retirement units, clause 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</u></p> <p><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</u></p> <p><u>b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally</u></p>	Supports MRZ-S7 and the outdoor living space provisions in principle which reflect the MDRS, with some additional / alternative provisions. As a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to MRZ-S7 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard. The matter of discretion refers to RESZ-P7 which is opposed. Matter of discretion (2) is supported.

			<p><u>accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u></p> <p><u>Delete reference to RESZ-P7 from the matters of discretion.</u></p>	
FS67.106	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.8-MRZ-S8 Outlook space - Per unit

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS75.11	Roger Gadd	Amend	<p>Clarify and correct “9. Outlook spaces must– ...</p> <p>b. Not extend over an outlook space or outdoor living space required by another dwelling.”</p>	<p>Submitter doesn’t believe compliance can be practically achieved with this part of the standard as written. Any window above ground level is likely to provide a view of someone else’s Outdoor space. Suggests that this standard should be re-written to permit and make it clear that-</p> <p>(i) Outlook Spaces of dwellings that have vertically aligned windows may share the same Outlook space from those windows,</p> <p>(ii) It would be permitted to look over an Outlook Space to the Outdoor Space of another dwelling. (suggests this issue should be considered as if an Outlook space has an imaginary floor at floor level, and for compliance, through which it must not be possible to see someone else’s Outdoor Space for a dwelling below.)</p>

FS17.662	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.212	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
FS17.880	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.245	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.219	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS118.105	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend MRZ-S8 as follows:</p> <p><b>MRZ-S8 Outlook space (per unit)</b></p> <p>...</p> <p>10. <u>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></p> <p><u>Delete reference to RESZ-P7</u> from the matters of discretion.</p>	<p>To provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>Supports MRZ-S8 and the outlook space provisions in principle, which reflect the MDRS. In a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. Amendments should be made to MRZ-S8 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages. The matter of discretion refers to RESZ-P7 which is opposed.</p>
FS67.107	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.9-MRZ-S9 Windows to street

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS75.12	Roger Gadd	Support	Perhaps clarify that this refers to 20% of the area of the façade, not 20% of its length. Perhaps provide an exemption for street level floors.	20% of the area of a street façade is a reasonable minimum to have glazed.
FS17.663	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.213	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this standard and acknowledges it is taken from the Resource Management

				(Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.
FS17.881	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.246	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.220	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.106	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Seeks to amend MRZ-S9 as follows to provide for retirement units:  <b>MRZ-S9 Windows to street</b>	Supports MRZ-S9 and the windows to street provisions in principle, which reflect the MDRS, with some additional direction to area of applicability. The standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.



			<p>1. Any residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> facing <del>the</del> a <u>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.</p> <p>2. This standard only applies to sites with a direct frontage to a <u>public</u> road and the residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> is within 15m of that frontage.</p>	
FS67.108	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.10-MRZ-S10 Rainwater tanks

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.214	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The volume of any individual rainwater tank must not exceed 5000 litres per site.</li> <li>2. <u>Rainwater tanks must not be located in a front yard, unless</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>They are at least 1.5m from the front boundary; and</u></li> <li>b. <u>They are a maximum height of 1m</u></li> </ol> </li> <li>3. <u>Rainwater tanks in any 'outlook space' must not be higher than 1m.</u></li> </ol>	<p>Generally supports the management of effects resulting from large rainwater tanks. Seeks additional standards be included to assist in achieving the overarching quality design outcomes.</p>

			4. <u>Rainwater tanks must not exceed 3m in height in a side or back yard.</u>	
FS17.882	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.87	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow placing a maximum tank volume as proposed in part 214 of OS76. While opposing the maximum allowable volume for water tanks submitter agrees with the proposed other standards for tank placement contained in OS76.214	Don't support limiting the volume of any individual rainwater tank to 5000 litres per site in a medium density residential zone.  We believe a minimum rather than a maximum volume should be stipulated. 5000 litres would be a suitable volume but if a home owner or developer desired to install a tank with greater volume (accepting that there should be standards around height and distance from boundaries) then that should be permitted.
FS99.247	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.221	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 13-MRZ - Medium Density Residential Zone > 13.5-Standards > 13.5.11-MRZ-S11 Fences and standalone walls along boundaries

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.45	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>1. <i>All fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of:</i></p> <p>a. <i><u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 1.2m for the length of the site boundary where that boundary is located between the front of a principal building and a road, except that the height above ground level can be up to 2m for up to 30% of the length of the boundary with a road;</u></i></p> <p>b. <i><u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 1.2m where a site boundary adjoins a public reserve, vested to Porirua City</u></i></p>	The erection of fences and walls may obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ.

			<p><i>Council under the Reserves Management Act; and</i></p> <p>c. <u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 2m for all other site boundaries.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u></p>	
FS17.178	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS75.13	Roger Gadd	Amend	Delete "b. 1.2m where a site boundary adjoins a public reserve, vested to Porirua City Council under the Reserves Management Act".	This part of the standard makes assumptions about the privacy of the residents, the privacy of the users of the reserve, and the nature of the reserve. In this situation it should be up to the owners to determine a suitable height of a fence.
FS17.664	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.215	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. All fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of:</p> <p>a. <del>1.2m</del> <u>1.5m</u> for the length of the site boundary where that boundary is located between the front of a principal building and a road, except that the height above ground level can be up to 2m for up</p>	Generally supports this standard but seeks an increase in the baseline height and that additional flexibility be provided for fences along public reserves to improve onsite amenity, while achieving quality design outcomes.

			<p>to <del>30</del>50% of the length of the boundary with a road;</p> <p>b. <del>1.2m</del> 1.5m where a site boundary adjoins a public reserve, vested to Porirua City Council under the Reserves Management Act, <u>or up to 2m where the section above 1.5m is at least 50% visually permeable;</u></p> <p>and</p> <p>c. 2m for all other site boundaries.</p>	
FS17.883	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.248	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.222	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.107	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Amend standard to provide for higher height of fences where some permeability is provided.	The fence height limit is opposed as it does not provide for the safety and security needs of retirement villages.
FS67.109	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.41	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revisions to notification preclusion statements.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required</li> </ul>

				<p>under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.709	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.41	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.74	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via

				wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.48	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.42	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revised provisions to clarify intended design outcomes.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>



FS17.710	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.40	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.75	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.49	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.43	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Changes to further enable residential development.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.711	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.39	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.76	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.50	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS76.220	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Retain [chapter introduction] as notified</p>	<p>Generally supports the introduction statement to the NCZ.</p>

FS17.888	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.253	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.227	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.112	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Delete or amend other NCZ objectives and policies for consistency [with additional policies sought in separate submission points].	Support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.
FS67.114	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.48	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new objective:  <b><u>NCZ-OX Infrastructure</u></b>  <i><u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></i>	Seeks a new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and ensures all land use activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. Provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.181	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.18	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to

				locate near the rail corridor the onus should be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.
FS118.160	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.49	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add new policy:  <b><u>NCZ-PX Servicing</u></b>  <i><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></i>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes provision of infrastructure and ensures that all land use activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.182	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.161	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.54	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new standard:	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<p><u><b>NCZ-SX Servicing</b></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	
FS17.187	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.171	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

OS118.109	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Seeks the following policy:</p> <p><b>Provision of housing for an ageing population</b></p> <p>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</p> <p>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</p> <p>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</p> <p>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p>	Policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.
FS67.111	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.110	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Seeks the following policy:</p> <p><b>Changing communities</b></p> <p>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p>	Policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.
FS67.112	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.111	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Seeks the following policy:	Policy support for retirement villages in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is required.



			<b>Larger sites</b> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.	
FS67.113	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.3-Objectives > 14.3.1-NCZ-O1 Purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.221	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the stated purpose of the zone.
FS17.889	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.254	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is

				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.228	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.3-Objectives > 14.3.2-NCZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.222	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the articulated planned urban built environment of the NCZ.
FS17.890	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.255	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude

				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.229	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.3-Objectives > 14.3.3-NCZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at Zone interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.10	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend NCZ O3 to read:  <b><i>NCZ O3 Use and development within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone:</i></b> <i>1. Is of an appropriate scale and proportion for the purpose and planned urban built environment of the zone; and</i> <i>2. Minimises adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones <u>and sustains a healthy and safe natural</u></i>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<u>environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u>	
FS17.64	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.128	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD.
FS127.461	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.223	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the management of interface effects at zone boundaries.
FS17.891	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.256	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.230	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.1-NCZ-P1 Appropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.224	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
FS17.892	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.257	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.231	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.2-NCZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.225	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy.
FS17.893	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.258	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.232	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS78.6	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support	Support	<p>Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.</p> <p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG),</p>

				<p>the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p> <p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.</p>
FS17.1032	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

# 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.3-NCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.226	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><del>Health</del> <b>Amenity and well-being for residential activity and residential units</b></p> <p>Enable residential activity and residential units where they provide a <u>healthy quality</u> urban built environment that provides for people’s <u>amenity and</u> well-being in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to sunlight, daylight and outdoor living space; <u>and</u></li> <li>2. Privacy and site design; <del>and</del></li> <li>3. <del>Consistency with the Residential Design Guide in APP3—Residential Design Guide.</del></li> </ol> <p><u>Note:</u></p>	<p>Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought. Also opposes the requirement that development is consistent with a design guide. Furthermore, opposes design guides being statutory elements of the District Plan. Kāinga Ora therefore seeks deletion of this arm of the policy, but would accept a note being placed instead, that refers to a non-statutory design guide that can be used as a tool for assessment.</p>

			<p><u><i>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</i></u></p> <p>-</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	
FS17.894	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.26	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject submission and retain reference to health instead of amenity or include reference to amenity in addition to reference to health.	It is critical that buildings and structures meet the health needs of communities in addition to amenity and well-being. As Kainga Ora recognises in its submission, amenity values can change over time and therefore can be difficult quantify compared to health needs. The provisions as notified provide a clearer standard to be achieved by retaining reference to health. In the event amenity is included, reference to health should also be referenced.
FS99.259	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance

				towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.193	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (amendments to NCZ-P3) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.233	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.108	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Seeks to amend NCZ-P3 as follows to remove the requirement for residential activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone to be consistent with the Residential Design Guide. .</p> <p><b>NCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units</b>  Provide for residential activity and residential units where it achieves a quality urban built environment that provides for people's well-being in respect of:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Contributing to the <del>Residential Design Guide in APP3 – Residential Design Guide</del> <u>planned urban built environment.</u></p>	<p>Not all developments (including retirement villages) are appropriately provided for by the Residential Design Guide.</p> <p>Supports NCZ-P3 and its provision for residential activities in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, but opposes the policy requirement for residential activities to be consistent with the Residential Design Guide. The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and provides no guidance as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village residential activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with a substantially differing functional and operational needs).</p>

FS67.110	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
----------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.4-NCZ-P4 Other activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.47	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend as follows:  <i>Provide for other activities within the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, including larger-scale commercial activities and retail activities, where:</i>  ...  <i><u>4. There is a functional and operational need to locate in the area.</u></i>	Supports NCZ-P4 insofar as it provides for other activities within the NCZ. However, seeks to include provision for other activities where there is a functional and operational need for them to locate within the NCZ.
FS17.180	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.227	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.895	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.260	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.234	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.5-NCZ-P5 Inappropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.358	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy.
FS17.1026	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.391	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.365	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.6-NCZ-P6 Built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.11	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend NCZ P6 to read:  <b><i>NCZ P6 Built Development</i></b>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<p><i>Provide for built development that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Is compatible with the purpose of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone</i></li> <li><i>2. Is well designed and contributes to an attractive urban built environment; and</i></li> <li><i>3. Is of a scale and intensity that is consistent with the planned urban built form and amenity values of the surrounding residential area.</i></li> <li><i>4. Minimise adverse effects on natural resources including:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. The effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</i></li> <li><i>b. The risks of excess and contaminated runoff from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</i></li> <li><i>c. The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
FS17.65	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.462	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.228	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy
FS17.896	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.261	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may



			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.235	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.7-NCZ-P7 Public space interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.229	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	supports this policy.
FS17.897	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.262	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.236	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.4-Policies > 14.4.8-NCZ-P8 Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.230	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy

FS17.898	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.263	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.237	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.37	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	It is unclear whether the interface with Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori is included and how impacts will be addressed regarding the buildings and structures.  NCZ-P8 could refer to this by including the narrative around the SASMs.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]

FS17.565	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.428	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.1-NCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.231	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this rule framework and associated preclusions to notification.
FS17.899	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.264	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance

				towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.238	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.113	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks that NCZ-R1 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:</p> <p><b>NCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures</b></p> <p>1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b></p> <p>....</p> <p>2. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with NCZ-R1.a.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standards.</p> <p><u>3. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance is not achieved with NCZ-R1.a.</u></p>	<p>To provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>Supports NCZ-R1 and the permitting of new buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. If the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have a set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support</p>

		<p><u>b. The application is for a retirement village. Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u></li> <li><u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></li> <li><u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></li> <li><u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></li> </ol> <p><u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 - 5, consider:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></li> <li><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>6. 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><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with NCZ-S2, NCZ-S3 or NCZ-S7 is precluded from</li> </ul>	<p>the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with NCZ-S4 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</li> <li>• An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village is precluded from being publicly notified.</li> <li>• An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village where compliance is achieved with NCZ-S1, NCZ-S2 and NCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</li> </ul>	
FS67.115	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.1-NCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 14.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.50	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>	Notes that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision consent, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the SUB – Subdivision chapter. Therefore, additional

			Where:  ...  <i>NCZ-SX is complied with.</i>	standards that will require the provision of firefighting water supply and access where development is not subject to subdivision provisions are requested.
FS17.183	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.170	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.10-NCZ-R10 Supported residential care activity > 14.5.10.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.232	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b>  Where:  The maximum occupancy does not exceed <del>six</del> <b>ten</b> residents.	Supports the permitted activity status of this activity but seeks that the number of residents is increased from six to ten. Notes such a change is consistent with other planning documents in the region, such as Wellington City's PDP
FS17.900	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.



FS99.265	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.239	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

**14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.10-NCZ-R10 Supported residential care activity > 14.5.10.2-2.  
Activity status: Restricted discretionary**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS76.233	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  <b>Notification:</b>  An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved is precluded from being publicly <u>or limited</u> notified in accordance with sections <u>95A and 95B</u> of the RMA.	Also seeks preclusion to limited notification in the event this threshold is breached.
FS17.901	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.266	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.240	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	--

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.13-NCZ-R13 Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.234	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity and resulting rule framework where compliance is not achieved.
FS17.902	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.267	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.241	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.38	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	NCZ-R13 is unclear yet again regarding papakāinga provisions. The rule provides little gross floor area for commercial and community facilities and as mentioned before, being inconsistent with the other Chapter Zones.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.566	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.429	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.14-NCZ-R14 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.235	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the rule framework, and in particular the preclusion to both limited and public notification where NCZ-S5 and NCZ-S6 are not met.

FS17.903	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.268	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.242	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.15-NCZ-R15 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS58.51	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Rule allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.184	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.5-Rules > 14.5.20-NCZ-R20 Retirement village

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.114	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity (with the construction of a retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity under NCZ-R1).</p> <p><b>NCZ-R20 Retirement village</b>  1. Activity status: <del>Discretionary</del> <b>Permitted</b></p>	<p>Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification or urban non-residential zones, the Neighbourhood Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in all zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>

FS67.116	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
----------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.1-NCZ-S1 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.52	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <u>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from NCZ-S1 and NCZ-S2 for hose drying towers.
FS17.185	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.236	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard.
FS17.904	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.269	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.243	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.27	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports a higher density of urban built form in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone. Supports the implementation of a higher density urban form through increased building heights than the standard zone height in specific areas. This is consistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1061	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.2-NCZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary



Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.53	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <u>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from NCZ-S1 and NCZ-S2 for hose drying towers.
FS17.186	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.237	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  1. All buildings and structures must not project beyond a:  a. 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along any side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a site zoned <b>Medium Density Residential Zone, Open Space Zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone</b> ; or  <u>b. 60° recession plane measured from a point 6m vertically above ground level along any side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a site located in the</u>	Generally supports this standard, but seeks additional flexibility be introduced for sites located within or adjacent to the MRZ-RIP.

			<p><u>Residential Intensification Precinct in the Medium Density Residential Zone; or</u></p> <p><u>c.</u> 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along any side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a site zoned High Density Residential Zone.</p>	
FS17.905	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.270	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.244	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.3-NCZ-S3 Setback

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS28.3	Paremata Business Park	Amend	<p>1. Buildings and structures must not be located within a 3m setback from a side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a <del>Medium Density Residential Zone, High Density Residential Zone, Open Space Zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone.</del></p> <p>2. Buildings and structures must not be located within a 1.5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</p> <p>LCZ-S3-1 does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One accessory building or structure less than 2m in height and less than 7m long per site; or</li> <li>• Fences or standalone walls.</li> </ul> <p>Or adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission, as necessary to give effect to this submission.</p>	The side yard requirements are overly restrictive and will not be conducive to creating compact local centres. There should be no increased side yard requirements between this zone and the Medium Density Residential and the High-Density Residential Zone. There is no need for a side yard setback of 3m. This exceeds the setback standards of the residential zones. The side yard setback in the Local Centre Zone is 1.5m, and the side yard setback in the Medium Density Residential Zone is 1m. Resulting in a 2.5 metre separation between buildings. Side yards with the residential zones should be reduced to 1.5m. Also, the local centre zone already has policies and standards in place managing reverse sensitivity there is no need for a 3m setback from the medium density zone and the high-density zone.
FS17.609	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.238	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Delete standard	Opposes this standard, as the scale and nature of buildings anticipated in the NCZ match that of the surrounding residential zone(s). This setback is considered unnecessary and will unduly constrain built

				development opportunities on smaller NCZ sites.
FS17.906	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.271	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.245	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.4-NCZ-S4 Active frontages

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.239	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.907	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.272	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.246	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.5-NCZ-S5 Location of residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.240	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified,	Supports this standard
FS17.908	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.273	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.247	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.6-NCZ-S6 Outdoor living space

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.241	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.909	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.274	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.248	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 14-NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone > 14.6-Standards > 14.6.7-NCZ-S7 Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS28.4	Paremata Business Park	Amend	<p><b><i>LCZ S7 – Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas</i></b></p> <p>[...]</p> <p><i>2. Any on-site parking area must:</i></p> <p><i>c. Be fully screened by a 1.8m high fence or landscaping from any directly adjoining site zoned High Density Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, <del>Open Space Zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone.</del></i></p> <p>Or adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission, as necessary to give effect to this submission</p>	Requiring screening of parking spaces next to open space and sports field does not make sense as often these areas also have parking areas on site. Enabling variation to the treatment of this boundary with a low fence, or no fence between an Open Space Zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone and a parking area, assists in connectivity between properties, passive security, and visual variation of boundary treatment. It will lead to better urban design outcomes than the requirement of a 1.8m high fence.
FS17.610	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.242	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard



FS17.910	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.275	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.249	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.36	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Increase height across the zone to 22m (6 storeys).	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.704	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.46	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.69	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.43	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS76.38	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Revisions to notification preclusion statements.</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.706	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.44	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an

				absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.71	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.45	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.39	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revised provisions to clarify intended design outcomes.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.707	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.43	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.72	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.46	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.40	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Changes to further enable residential development.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as</li> </ul>

				<p>to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.708	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.42	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.73	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude



				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.47	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.246	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Delete paragraph 3 [introduction]  <del>Some areas have been identified as being suited to a more intensive built form through increased building heights than the standard zone height. These areas are located within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone or a train station. They are identified on the planning maps as Height Increase A and Height Increase B.</del>	Generally supports the introduction statement to the LCZ.  Amendments are sought to remove reference to Height Increase A and Height Increase B, as a consequence of the increase in the overall height limit across the zone to 22m. Deletion of paragraph three is therefore sought.  Also seeks deletion of the reference to "Height Controls – Heritage" in paragraph four. Kāinga Ora supports managing development next to listed heritage sites but seeks an alternative tool to manage the effects.
FS17.914	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.279	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.253	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.247	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend paragraph 4 [introduction]  Specific sites have been identified where additional controls are necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of buildings and structures on the social, physical and surroundings heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings. <del>They are identified on the planning maps as Height Controls—Heritage.</del> They are qualifying matters under s770 of the RMA.	Generally supports the introduction statement to the LCZ.  Amendments are sought to remove reference to Height Increase A and Height Increase B, as a consequence of the increase in the overall height limit across the zone to 22m. Deletion of paragraph three is therefore sought.  Also seeks deletion of the reference to "Height Controls – Heritage" in paragraph four. Kāinga Ora supports managing

				development next to listed heritage sites but seeks an alternative tool to manage the effects.
FS17.915	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.126	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS99.280	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.254	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.18	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	The introduction of LCZ mentions and refers to the Historic Heritage and sites, and not to the SASMs. To ensure that where additional controls are necessary not to 'mitigate' but strengthen the drafting intention. Related to this, for instance, LCZ-O3 ' <i>Managing the scale of use and development at Zone interface</i> ', Clause 2 can be stronger than it is worded now and SASMs should be added to the list (which already includes Open Space and Recreation Zones).	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.546	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.409	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.23	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	It is encouraging to see the provision LCZ-R23 'Drive-Through' is a discretionary activity and land use does not encourage more car usage and car travel. This should probably come through in the introduction where the purpose of the Rule is to reduce carbon emissions and influencing the behaviour around more driving around.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]

FS17.551	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.414	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.56	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new objective:  <u><i>LCZ-OX Infrastructure</i></u>  <u><i>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</i></u>  -	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Metropolitan Centre Zone and ensures all land use activities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.189	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.19	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring

				development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.
FS118.162	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.57	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new policy:  <b><u>LCZ-PX Servicing</u></b>  <i><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></i>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Metropolitan Centre Zone and ensures all land use activities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.190	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS118.163	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.62	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add a new standard:</p> <p><u><i>LCZ-SX Servicing</i></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u><i>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</i></u></li> <li><u><i>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</i></u></li> </ol> <p><u><i>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</i></u></p>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.
FS17.195	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS118.173	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.
-----------	---	--------	----------------------------	--

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.3-Objectives > 15.3.1-LCZ-01

### Purpose of the Local Centre Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.248	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the stated purpose of the zone.
FS17.916	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.281	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people



FS127.255	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.3-Objectives > 15.3.2-LCZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Local Centre Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.249	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>The Local Centre Zone is a safe and attractive urban built environment, that is characterised by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1. Medium-rise buildings</del> that contribute positively to the surrounding streetscape and residential environment; <u>and</u></li> <li><del>A greater intensity of built urban form in locations accessible to the Metropolitan Centre Zone or a train station, identified by height increase controls on the planning maps;</del></li> <li>Sites and buildings used for residential purposes that provide good quality on-site residential amenity for the health and well-</li> </ol>	<p>Generally supports this objective, which clearly sets out the planned urban built environment of the LCZ but seeks changes to recognise that the anticipated urban built form will be greater than medium rise in many situations.</p> <p>As a consequence of the submission seeking additional height across the zone to 22m, Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of the second arm of this policy.</p>

			being of people residing in the Zone.	
FS17.917	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.282	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.256	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.3-Objectives > 15.3.3-LCZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at Zone interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.12	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend LCZ O3 to read:  <b><i>Managing the scale of development at the Zone interface Use and development within the Local Centre Zone:</i></b> <i>1. Are of an appropriate scale and proportion for the purpose and planned urban built environment of the zone; and</i> <i>2. Minimise adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones</i> <i>3. <u>Sustains a healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u></i>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.
FS17.66	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS114.57	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	We seek for this part of the submission requesting amendments to various zones such as LCZ-O3, NCZ-P6 and NCZ-O3 and other zones that are not outlined in this document to target tighter environmental and water quality outcomes as requested by the submitter outlining that development should sustain a healthy natural environment, to be allowed.	This submission aims proposed provisions to be improved regarding land development being positive for the wellbeing of the natural environment and water bodies but especially for our Te Awarua o Porirua. Amending this provision as requested will change provisions for the better and ensure that we are protecting and improving the quality of Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour via tighter plan provisions.

FS118.129	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD.
FS127.463	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.250	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the management of interface effects at zone boundaries.
FS17.918	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.283	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.257	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS114.19	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	<p>The introduction of LCZ mentions and refers to the Historic Heritage and sites, and not to the SASMs. To ensure that where additional controls are necessary not to 'mitigate' but strengthen the drafting intention. Related to this, for instance, LCZ-O3 'Managing the scale of use and development at Zone interface', Clause 2 can be stronger than it is worded now and SASMs should be added to the list (which already includes Open Space and Recreation Zones).</p> <p>Instead of using the phrase 'minimise' for these areas of interface, the plan provisions need to make sure these less-than-ideal interactions between SASMs and LCZ are not created in the first place.</p>	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.547	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.410	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.21	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	<p>LCZ-P11 Qualifying Matters - effects on historic heritage and urban environment, should include the SASMs as an additional third clause.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>Instead of using the phrase 'minimise' for these areas of interface, the plan provisions need to make sure these less-than-ideal interactions between SASMs and LCZ are not created in the first place.</p> <p>[See also submission on LCZ-03 and refer to original submission for full reason]</p>

FS17.549	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.412	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.1-LCZ-P1

### Appropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.251	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Enable activities that <u>support the needs of local communities and</u> are compatible with the planned purpose and urban built environment of the Local Centre Zone.	Generally supports this policy but seeks amendment to more specifically recognise that Local Centres service and support the local communities in which they are located.
FS17.919	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.284	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude

				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.258	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.2-LCZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.252	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.920	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.285	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.259	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS78.5	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support	Support	<p>Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.</p> <p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near</p>



				<p>the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG), the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p> <p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.</p>
FS17.1031	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.3-LCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.253	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><b>Health Amenity and well-being for residential activity and residential units</b></p> <p>Enable residential activity and residential units where they provide a <b>healthy quality</b> urban built environment that provides for people's <b>amenity and</b> well-being in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to sunlight, daylight and outdoor living space; and</li> <li>2. Privacy and site design</li> </ol>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought.
FS17.921	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.27	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject submission and retain reference to health instead of amenity or include reference to amenity in addition to reference to health.	It is critical that buildings and structures meet the health needs of communities in addition to amenity and well-being. As Kainga Ora recognises in its submission, amenity values can change over time and therefore can be difficult quantify compared to health needs. The provisions as notified provide a clearer standard to be achieved by retaining reference to health. In the event amenity is included ,reference to health should also be referenced.

FS99.286	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.260	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.4-LCZ-P4 Other activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.55	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:	Supports LCZ-P4 insofar as it provides for other activities within the LCZ. However, seeks to include provision for other activities where there is a functional and

			<p><i>Provide for other activities within the Local Centre Zone, including larger-scale activities where:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i><u>5. There is a functional and operational need to locate in the area.</u></i></p>	operational need for them to locate within the LCZ.
FS17.188	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.254	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Provide for other activities including larger-scale activities where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any significant adverse effects, <del>including reverse sensitivity effects,</del> can be avoided, remedied or mitigated;</li> <li>2. The activity is consistent with the planned urban built environment and does not compromise activities that are enabled within the Local Centre Zone;</li> <li>3. For any retirement village: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. On-site amenity for residents is provided, which reflects the nature of and diverse needs of residents of the village; and</li> <li>b. Any potential reverse sensitivity effects on the continued operation of non-</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to remove explicit mention to reverse sensitivity effects.

			<p>residential activities are minimised;</p> <p>4. They are of a size and scale that does not undermine the role and function of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.</p>	
FS17.922	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.28	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject submission.	Reverse sensitivity is a significant effect that must be managed, particularly in the context of intensification near lawfully established infrastructure as it risks a higher number of sensitive receivers being located at the interface with established effects-generating activities, such as the rail network. Where reverse sensitivity is not appropriately recognised in the planning framework, it can lead to poor management of the interface between these activities, both in terms of health and amenity effects on sensitive receivers, and risks leading to undue constraints on the operation of the rail network to manage those effects.
FS99.287	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.261	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.115	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Delete LCZ-P4(3) and replace with the following policies:</p> <p><b>Provision of housing for an ageing population</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</li> <li>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</li> <li>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Supports LCZ-P4 providing for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone. However, it does not consider the policy is sufficiently enabling and it opposes the proposed policy requirement for on-site amenity to be regulated. The reference to reverse sensitivity is covered by P2.

			<p>needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p><b>Changing communities</b> To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p><b>Larger sites</b> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p> <p>Delete or amend other LCZ objectives and policies for consistency.</p>	
FS67.117	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.5-LCZ-P5 Inappropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.255	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.923	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.



FS99.288	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.262	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.6-LCZ-P6 Small scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.256	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy

FS17.924	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.289	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.263	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.7-LCZ-P7 Larger scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS76.257	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Provide for larger-scale built development that <u>reflects the planned urban built environment of the Local Centre Zone where it can be demonstrated that the development contributes positive design outcomes taking into consideration the following design objectives as relevant to the specific site, development type, and the planned urban built environment of the zone:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Optimise the quality of the outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Buildings spatially define street edges in order to contribute to a high-quality public realm.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Provision is made for safe and convenient pedestrian movement.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Servicing and parking is functional and maintains a high level of public realm amenity.</u></li> <li>5. <u>Provide for reasonable light, outlook, and internal amenity for occupied internal spaces.</u></li> <li>6. <u>Achieve visual interest and avoid visual monotony while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li> <li>7. <u>Achieve integrated building top and roof design.</u></li> </ol>	<p>Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought directly within the policy (which is the referenced matter of discretion against the relevant rule).</p> <p>Consistent with its broader submission, opposes the reference to a statutory design guide and seeks the relevant assessment matters instead be directly articulated in the relevant provision/matter of discretion. Would support the use of non-statutory design guides as a tool to inform assessment.</p>
----------	------------------------------------	-------	---	--

			<p>8. <u>Ensure materials and detailing are suitably robust and fit-for-purpose in order to maintain their appearance over time.</u></p> <p>9. <u>Street edges are visually interesting and active, which contribute to the safety and attractiveness of their setting.</u></p> <p>10. <u>Relevant sections of RESZ-P10 in regard to residential units and activities.</u></p> <p><i>Note:</i></p> <p><i>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</i></p> <p>that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Acknowledges and reflects the planned urban built environment of the Local Centre Zone; and</del></li> <li>2. <del>Is consistent with the Local Centre Zone Design Guide contained in APP7-Local Centre Zone Design Guide.</del></li> </ol>	
FS17.925	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.290	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS118.194	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	<p>The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (amendments to LCZ-P7) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.</p>
FS127.264	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.8-LCZ-P8 Height variation Control

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.258	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
FS17.926	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.291	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.265	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.9-LCZ-P9 Public space interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.259	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
FS17.927	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.292	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.266	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.4-Policies > 15.4.10-LCZ-P10

## Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.13	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	<p>Amend LCZ P10 to read:</p> <p><b><i>Interface with Residential Zones, and Open Space and Recreation Zones</i></b></p> <p><i>Minimise the adverse effects from use and development within the Local Centre Zone on directly adjoining sites zoned Residential or Open Space and Recreation by ensuring that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Buildings and activities are located and designed to achieve a transition at the zone interface</i></li> <li><i>2. Buildings are located and designed to minimise shading and privacy effects</i></li> <li><i>3. Buildings are of a bulk, height and form that minimises dominance and/or enclosure effects</i></li> <li><i>4. Screening and landscaping minimise adverse visual effects</i></li> <li><i>5. <u>The effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies are minimised</u></i></li> <li><i>6. <u>The risks of excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems are minimised; and</u></i></li> <li><i>7. <u>The adverse and potentially irreversible</u></i></li> </ol>	<p>To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.</p>



			<i>effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients are minimised.</i>	
FS17.67	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.464	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.260	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
FS17.928	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.293	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.267	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.20	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	In relation to this Objective, Policy LCZ-P10 should also include mention of SASMs and adverse effects.  [See also submission on LCZ-03 and refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Instead of using the phrase ‘minimise’ for these areas of interface, the plan provisions need to make sure these less-than-ideal interactions between SASMs and LCZ are not created in the first place.  [See also submission on LCZ-03 and refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.548	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.411	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.1-LCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.261	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this rule framework and associated preclusions to notification.
FS17.929	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.294	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.268	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS118.116	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks that LCZ-R1 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:</p> <p><b>LCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures</b></p> <p>1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The gross floor area of the new building or structure, or addition to an existing building or structure is no more than 450m<sup>2</sup>; and</p>	<p>To provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>Supports LCZ-R1 and the permitting of new buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards.</p> <p>If the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity,</p>

		<p>b. Compliance is achieved with: ...</p> <p>2. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with LCZ-R1.a. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in LCZ-P7.</p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly and limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p> <p>3. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with LCZ-R1-1.b. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with LCZ-S2, LCZ-S3 or LCZ-S7 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</li> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved</li> </ul>	<p>and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have a set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>with LCZ-S4 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p> <p><b>3. Activity status: <u>Restricted discretionary</u></b>  <b><u>Where:</u></b>  <b><u>a. Compliance is not achieved with LCZ-R1-1a or</u></b>  <b><u>b. The application is for a retirement village.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></b>  <b><u>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u></b>  <b><u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></b>  <b><u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></b>  <b><u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></b>  <b><u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 - 5, consider:</u></b>  <b><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></b>  <b><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></b>  <b><u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement</u></b></p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p><u>village.</u></p> <p><u>or clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p> <p><b><u>Notification:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></li> <li>• <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village where compliance is achieved with LCZ-S1, LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></li> </ul>	
FS67.118	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

**15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.1-LCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 15.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.58	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  ...  <i>LCZ-SX is complied with.</i>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.191	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.172	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.11-LCZ-R11

### Supported residential care activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.262	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity.
FS17.930	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.295	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.269	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.12-LCZ-R12

### Community corrections activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.5	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Support	Retain Rule LCZ-R12.	<p>Rule LCZ-R12 provides for “community corrections activity” as a permitted activity in the Local Centre Zone. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and</p>



				<p>resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Making community corrections activities permitted in the Local Centre Zone addresses the Submitter's primary submission on the PPDP seeking its inclusion.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
--	--	--	--	---

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.15-LCZ-R15

### Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.263	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity and resulting rule framework where compliance is not achieved.
FS17.931	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.296	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.270	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.22	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Pāpakainga rule LCZ-R15 as the comments Te Rūnanga made above regarding other chapters, has references to commercial and community facilities not being more than 450 square meters. These discrepancies will need to be addressed; they are keen to understand what evidence was there to pick up differing numbers.  [Refer to original submission for decision requested]	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.550	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.413	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

# 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.16-LCZ-R16

## Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 15.5.16.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.264	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <p><del>a. No more than three residential units occupy the site; and</del></p> <p><del>b. a.</del> Compliance is achieved with</p> <p>i. LCZ-S5; and</p> <p>ii. LCZ-S6.</p>	Supports the preclusion to both limited and public notification in this rule framework. However, seeks no maximum threshold on the number of permitted units, and therefore seeks a change to this rule.
FS17.932	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.297	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.271	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.16-LCZ-R16 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 15.5.16.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.265	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Delete: <p><del>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</del></p> <p><del>Where:</del></p> <p>1. <del>Compliance is not achieved with LCZ-R16-1.a.</del></p>	Supports the preclusion to both limited and public notification in this rule framework. However, seeks no maximum threshold on the number of permitted units, and therefore seeks a change to this rule.

			<p><del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del></p> <p>1. <del>The matters in <a href="#">LCZ-P7</a>.</del></p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</del></li> </ul> <p>[consequential re-numbering]</p>	
FS17.933	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.298	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.272	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	--

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.18-LCZ-R18 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.59	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted	Supports LCZ-R18 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.192	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.5-Rules > 15.5.19-LCZ-R19 Retirement village

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.117	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity (with the construction of a retirement villages	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification or urban non-residential

			<p>provided for as a restricted discretionary activity under LCZ-R1).</p> <p><b>LCZ-R19 Retirement village</b>  1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del>  <b>Permitted</b>  Matters of discretion are restricted to:  1. The matters in LCZ-P4.  <b>Notification:</b>  An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</p>	<p>zones, the Local Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in all zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>
FS67.119	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.1-LCZ-S1 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.60	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i></p>	<p>Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S3 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers</p>
FS17.193	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS76.266	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. All buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>22m-18m; or</del></li> <li>2. <del>22m on sites subject to the Height Increase A identified on the planning maps; or</del></li> </ol> <p>Consequential deletion of matters of discretion that refer to policies relevant to the matters being deleted.</p>	<p>seeks changes to the permitted height – with a standard 22m height limit across the zone sought.</p>
FS17.934	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS99.299	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire</p>



				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.273	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.267	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  1. All buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of:  <del>12m on sites subject to Height Control— Heritage B shown on the planning maps.</del>  Consequential deletion of matters of discretion that refer to policies relevant to the matters being deleted.	Does not support the application of height controls on sites that adjoin identified heritage sites. Instead, Would support the use of HIRB on boundaries adjoining sites with identified values. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter and consequential amendments.
FS17.935	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.300	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.274	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.28	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports a higher density of urban built form in the Local Centre Zone. Supports the implementation of a higher density urban form through increased building heights than the standard zone height in specific areas. This is in accordance with Policy 3 (d) of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1062	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.2-LCZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.61	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational

			<p>...</p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u></p>	<p>requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from LCZ-S2 and LCZ-S3 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers</p>
FS17.194	Leigh Subritzky	Support	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.</p>
OS76.268	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. All buildings and structures must not project beyond a:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along any side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a site zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, Open Space Zone or Sport and Active Recreation Zone; or</li> <li>2. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along any side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a site zoned High Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>3. <u>Except no part of any building or structure may project beyond a:</u></li> </ol>	<p>Generally supports this standard but seeks amendment (with any consequential changes to maps and rule references) to introduce a more restrictive HIRB on boundaries adjacent to a listed heritage site or SASM.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along any boundary with a site containing a heritage item or heritage setting for sites subject to HIRB Control Heritage B;</u></li> <li>ii. <u>45° recession plane measured from a point 3m vertically above ground level on any boundary with a site containing a heritage item or heritage setting for sites subject to HIRB Control Heritage A; or</u></li> <li>iii. <u>45° recession plane measured from a point 3m vertically above ground level on any boundary with a site containing an identified site of or areas of significance to Māori.</u></li> </ul>	
FS17.936	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.301	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.275	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.3-LCZ-S3 Setback

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS72.7	KiwiRail	Amend	[...]  2. Buildings and structures must not be located within a <del>1.5m</del> 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.	The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will: (a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district; (d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally

				significant infrastructure; (e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.
FS17.304	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.374	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as the proposed 1.5m set back provides 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.
OS76.269	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.937	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.302	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.276	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS82.8	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	<p>1. Buildings and structures must not be located within a 3m setback from a side or rear boundary where that boundary adjoins a General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone, Open Space Zone, <del>or</del> Sport and Active Recreation Zone, <u>or a Significant Natural Area</u>.</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One accessory building or structure less than 2m in height and less than 7m long per site.</li> <li>- Fences and standalone walls.</li> </ul>	The “Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ)” planned within the NGA is adjacent to a highly significant QEII covenant and SNA (SNA029). Apply the setback standards for NCZ to any boundary of the NCZ that adjoins a Significant Natural Area, as well as the other zones in the existing provision. This minor setback would ensure some of the potentially substantial effects of the development on SNA are reduced. This change would be particularly important if the council does not adopt our proposed amendment to the subdivision rules (DEV-NG-R3).
FS17.1084	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.99	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.

FS74.163	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments as requested by the submitter.	Greater Wellington support the requested amendments which provide protection for the significant natural area as these changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and help to give effect to Operative RPS Policy 24.
FS127.390	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.4-LCZ-S4 Active street frontages

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.270	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard.
FS17.938	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.303	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood



				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.277	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.5-LCZ-S5

### Location of residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.271	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this standard.
FS17.939	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.304	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude

				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.278	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.6-LCZ-S6 Outdoor living space

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.272	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard.
FS17.940	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.305	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.279	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 15-LCZ - Local Centre Zone > 15.6-Standards > 15.6.7-LCZ-S7 Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.273	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this standard.
FS17.941	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.306	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.280	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.337	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified [chapter introduction]	Generally supports the introduction statement to the LCZ.
FS17.1005	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.370	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.344	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.349	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Amendments sought:  Relocate objectives, policies, and rules associated with the Whitireia Tertiary Education Precinct from LFRZ to the MCZ, with all consequential changes.	Seeks the relocation of the Whitireia Tertiary Education Precinct from the LFRZ to the MCZ, with consequential updates to the precinct provisions and the MCZ chapter to reflect the rehousing of this precinct
FS17.1017	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.382	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.356	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS84.1	Oyster Management Limited	Not Stated	Supports the amendments to the provisions in the Large Format Retail zone in Variation 1 where those provisions:  (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD;  (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments;  (c) are consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA); (	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]

			<p>d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA;</p> <p>(e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and</p> <p>(f) are consistent with sound resource management practice.</p>	
FS17.1105	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS114.9	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Amend the fourth paragraph of the introduction to the Chapter from 'enhance the relationship' to 'provide for relationship' so that the first sentence of the same paragraph can be matched with a stronger statement as '... also need to address ...'	Large Format Retail Zone in Elsdon and Porirua City Centre are large areas in Porirua that interact with several different environments. These areas are not only visited by Porirua residents and communities but also attract visitors from outside Porirua City. Te Rūnanga have noticed this Zone Chapter can be improved by having a clear and more directive reference to Te Awarua o Porirua and Porirua Stream in the introduction.
FS17.537	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.400	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.65	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new objective:  <u><i>LFRZ-OX Infrastructure</i></u>  <u><i>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</i></u>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the LFRZ and ensures all land use activities in the LFRZ are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.198	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.20	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should



				be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.
OS58.66	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new policy:  <b><u>LFRZ-PX Servicing</u></b> <i><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></i>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the LFRZ and ensures all land use activities in the LFRZ are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.199	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.71	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new standard:  <b><u>LFRZ-SX Servicing</u></b>  1. <i><u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></i>  2. <i><u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must</u></i>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<p><i><u>demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></i></p>	
FS17.204	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.3-Objectives

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.10	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Not Stated	[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	As a common thread throughout the new proposed chapters in the Plan, LFRZ objectives do not come across as objectives: '...accommodates large format retail development that services Porirua City's and the wider region's need for large-scale retail...' In the purpose of improving the drafting clarity of these, for instance, LFRZ-O2 could ensure that LFRZ provides for best practice land use and behaviour looking after the environment. A clause can be added to say: <i>retail zone reduces its environmental footprint and encourages its users to be more sustainable by...</i>

FS17.538	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.401	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.3-Objectives > 16.3.2-LFRZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Large Format Retail Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.63	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted	Supports MRZ-PRECO2-O1 insofar as it promotes a safe urban built environment within the LFRZ which provides for the well-being of people residing in the zone.
FS17.196	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS84.3	Oyster Management Limited	Support	Retain Objective LFRZ-O2 as notified.	Supports the amendments proposed to Objective LFRZ-O2 as they enable the development as anticipated in a tier 1 urban environment and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
FS17.1107	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS114.11	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	As a common thread throughout the new proposed chapters in the Plan, LFRZ

				objectives do not come across as objectives: '...accommodates large format retail development that services Porirua City's and the wider region's need for large-scale retail...' In the purpose of improving the drafting clarity of these, for instance, LFRZ-O2 could ensure that LFRZ provides for best practice land use and behaviour looking after the environment. A clause can be added to say: <i>retail zone reduces its environmental footprint and encourages its users to be more sustainable by...</i>
FS17.539	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.402	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.3-Objectives > 16.3.3-LFRZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at zone interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.14	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend LFRZ O3 to read:  <b><i>Use and development within the Large Format Retail Zone:</i></b> <i>1. Are of an appropriate scale and</i>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<p><i>proportion for the purpose and planned urban built environment of the zone; and</i></p> <p><i>2. Minimise adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones</i></p> <p><i>3. <u>Sustains a healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u></i></p>	
FS17.68	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.130	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD.
FS127.465	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS114.12	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	LFRZ-O3 clauses, regarding the use and development within the Large Format Retail Zone, can be strengthened to include effects other than amenity and visual, such as stormwater discharges and run off and any other adverse effect that might impact on the Harbour and the Stream.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.540	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.169	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek inclusion of provisions which promote the positive effects of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems	Greater Wellington support provisions that aim to protect and improve the environmental quality of Te Awarua o Porirua and its catchments.

FS127.403	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
-----------	---------------	---------	--	---

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.2-LFRZ-P2 Location of residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.338	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.1006	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.371	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.345	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.3-LFRZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.339	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><b>Health Amenity and well-being for residential activity and residential units</b></p> <p>Enable residential activity and residential units where they provide a <b>healthy quality</b> urban built environment that provides for people's <b>amenity and</b> well-being in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to sunlight, daylight and outdoor living space; and</li> <li>2. Privacy and site design.</li> </ol>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought
FS17.1007	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS72.30	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject submission and retain reference to health instead of amenity or include reference to amenity in addition to reference to health.	It is critical that buildings and structures meet the health needs of communities in addition to amenity and well-being. As Kainga Ora recognises in its submission, amenity values can change over time and therefore can be difficult quantify compared to health needs. The provisions as notified provide a clearer standard to be achieved by retaining reference to health. In the event amenity is included, reference to health should also be referenced.
FS99.372	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.346	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.



## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.4-LFRZ-P4 Other activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.64	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Provide for other activities within the Large Format Retail Zone where:</i>  ...  <i><u>4. There is a functional and operational need to locate in the area.</u></i>	Supports LFRZ-P4 insofar as it provides for other activities within the LFRZ. However, seeks to include provision for other activities where there is a functional and operational need for them to locate within the LFRZ.
FS17.197	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS114.13	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Not Stated	LFRZ-P4 seems to be vague, in the sense that if the activities are in line with protecting and making environment better, this should be spelled out.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.541	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.404	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.5-LFRZ-P5 Inappropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.15	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend LFRZ P5 to read:  <b><i>Inappropriate Activities</i></b> <i>Avoid activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the Large Format Retail Zone and that risk causing adverse effects on natural resources including:</i> <i>1. The adverse effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</i> <i>2. The adverse effects caused by excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</i> <i>3. The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</i>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.
FS17.69	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.466	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.7-LFRZ-P7 Larger scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.340	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought directly within the policy

		<p>Provide for larger-scale built development that <u>reflects the planned urban built environment of the Large Format Retail Zone where it can be demonstrated that the development contributes positive design outcomes taking into consideration the following design objectives as relevant to the specific site, development type, and the planned urban built environment of the zone:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Optimise the quality of the outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Buildings are located on site and planned to shape positive open space, and complement the buildings, sites, and streets around them.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Provision is made for safe and convenient pedestrian movement.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Servicing and parking is functional and maintains a high level of public realm amenity.</u></li> <li>5. <u>Provide for reasonable light, outlook, and internal amenity for occupied internal spaces.</u></li> <li>6. <u>Achieve visual interest and avoid visual monotony while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li> <li>7. <u>Achieve integrated building top and roof design.</u></li> </ol>	<p>(which is the referenced matter of discretion against the relevant rule).</p> <p>Consistent with its broader submission, Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to a statutory design guide and seeks the relevant assessment matters instead be directly articulated in the relevant provision/matter of discretion. Would support the use of non-statutory design guides as a tool to inform assessment.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>8. <u>Ensure materials and detailing are suitably robust and fit-for-purpose in order to maintain their appearance over time.</u></p> <p>9. <u>Where applicable, the connection to the Porirua Stream is enhanced and potential impacts on the openness and historical and cultural values of the stream are addressed.</u></p> <p>10. <u>Achieve street and building edges that are visually interesting and active, and which contribute to the safety and attractiveness of the area.</u></p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></p> <p><u>that:</u></p> <p>1. <del>Acknowledges and reflects the planned urban built environment of the Large Format Retail Zone; and</del></p> <p>2. <del>Is consistent with the Large Format Retail Zone Design Guide contained in APP6—Large Format Retail Zone Design Guide.</del></p>	
FS17.1008	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.373	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.347	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.8-LFRZ-P8 Public space interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.341	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.

FS17.1009	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.374	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.348	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.14	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	LFRZ-P8 clause 3 can be strengthened by removing <i>where applicable</i> , and use the word <i>provide for, instead of enhancing</i> .	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.542	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.405	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses

				significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
--	--	--	--	---

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.4-Policies > 16.4.9-LFRZ-P9 Interface with Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.15	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	LFRZ-P9 does not include the interface with the SASMs and instead of 'minimise', the wording could be stronger. It is unclear, how this zone, given that it is car-intensive, will aim to reduce its users' carbon footprint as District Plan should not take that for granted.	Te Rūnanga are aware that there are a few rules permitting and encouraging further car usage such as, drive-throughs.  [For part of submission there is no specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.543	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.406	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.1-LFRZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 16.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.67	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  ...  <i>LFRZ-SX is complied with.</i>	Notes that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision consent, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the SUB – Subdivision chapter. Therefore, additional standards that will require the provision of firefighting water supply and access where development is not subject to subdivision provisions are requested.
FS17.200	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.5-LFRZ-R5 Drive-through activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.17	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	LFRZ-S5 could be used to address other matters that the large retail can be encouraged to innovate. For instance, matters of discretion 2 can be furthered to include that it is not just about the connection with Te Awarua o Porirua.	It is encouraging to see the standard LFRZ-S5 however, the wording and drafting intent should be more directive and stronger; must not be just about the aesthetic reasons.
FS17.545	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.408	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.



## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.7-LFRZ-R7 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 16.5.7.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.342	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b>  Where:  <del>a. No more than three residential units occupy the site; and</del>  <del>b. a.</del> Compliance is achieved with  i. LFRZ-S8; and ii. LFRZ-S9.	
FS17.1010	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.375	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.349	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.7-LFRZ-R7 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 16.5.7.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.343	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p><i>Amendments sought</i></p> <p><del>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</del></p> <p><del>Where:</del></p> <p>1. <del>Compliance is not achieved with LFRZ-R7-1.a.</del></p>	Supports the preclusion to both limited and public notification in this rule framework. However, Kāinga Ora seeks no maximum threshold on the number of permitted units, and therefore seeks a change to this rule.

			<p><del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del></p> <p>1. <del>The matters in <u>LFRZ-P7</u>.</del></p> <p><del><b>Notification:</b></del></p> <p><del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</del></p>	
FS17.1011	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.376	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.350	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	--

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.7-LFRZ-R7 Residential activity and residential unit, excluding papakāinga > 16.5.7.3-3. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.344	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>[consequential renumbering]</p> <p><del>3-</del> <b>2.</b> Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compliance is not achieved with LFRZ-S8 and LFRZ-S9.</li> </ol> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <p>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with LFRZ-S8 or LFRZ-S9 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p>	Supports the preclusion to both limited and public notification in this rule framework. However, Kāinga Ora seeks no maximum threshold on the number of permitted units, and therefore seeks a change to this rule.

FS17.1012	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.377	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.351	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.8-LFRZ-R8 Supported residential care activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS76.345	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity.
FS17.1013	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.378	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.352	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.12-LFRZ-R12 Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.16	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Te Rūnanga seeks relief with reference to their comment on HRZ regarding Papakāinga. Refer to inconsistencies mentioned above.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.544	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.407	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.5-Rules > 16.5.22-LFRZ-R22 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.68	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted	Supports LFRZ-R22 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth,

				population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.201	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.1-LFRZ-S1 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.69	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from LFRZ-S1 and LFRZ-S2 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers
FS17.202	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.346	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the 22m height limit applying in the LFRZ. This support is subject to the LFRZ at the northern extent of the city centre being rezoned MCZ, and a corresponding change in height occurring in this location.
FS17.1014	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.



FS99.379	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.353	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS84.4	Oyster Management Limited	Support	Retain Standard LFRZ-S1 as notified.	Supports the amendment proposed to standard to provide a permitted building height of 22m. This is appropriate as it will enable height limits of an appropriate scale within the zone, and as required within the walkable catchment from the Metropolitan Centre. This zone is intended to accommodate large format retail that services Porirua City and the region, and this height limit is appropriate to achieve that purpose.

FS17.1108	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
-----------	-----------------	--------	--	---

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.2-LFRZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.70	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from LFRZ-S1 and LFRZ-S2 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers
FS17.203	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS84.5	Oyster Management Limited	Support	Retain standard LFRZ-S2 as notified.	Supports the amendment proposed to standard. Amending the height in relation to boundary controls is supported to the extent that it enables density that is of an appropriate scale and form in light of the planned built environment of the Large Format Retail zone.
FS17.1109	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.8-LFRZ-S8 Location of residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.347	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.1015	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.380	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.354	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 16-LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone > 16.6-Standards > 16.6.9-LFRZ-S9 Outdoor living space

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.348	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.1016	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.381	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.355	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.45	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revised provisions to clarify intended design outcomes.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.713	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.37	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.78	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.52	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS76.279	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Retain Mixed Use Zone and spatial extent as notified, with the exception of the MUZ to</p>	<p>Generally supports the use of and spatial extent of the Mixed Use Zone; although seeking that the proposed MUZ to</p>

			the east of the Mungavin Interchange (west of Rānui), where HRZ is sought.	the east of the Mungavin Interchange is rezoned to HRZ.
FS17.947	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.156	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.312	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.286	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been

				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.281	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend introduction:  Specific sites have been identified where additional controls are necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of buildings and structures on the social, physical and surroundings heritage values of heritage items and heritage settings. <del>They are identified on the planning maps as Height Controls—Heritage.</del> They are qualifying matters under s770 of the RMA.	Generally supports the introduction statement to the MUZ. Changes are sought to reference to “Height Controls – Heritage” at paragraph four. While Kāinga Ora accepts and supports the appropriate management of effects upon listed heritage sites and settings, it seeks that these be controlled through the use of a varied HIRB, in place of the proposed Height Control. Changes are sought to reflect this.
FS17.949	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.127	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.



FS99.314	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.288	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.73	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new objective:  <b><u>MUZ-OX Infrastructure</u></b>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the MUZ and ensures all land use activities in the MUZ are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better

			<u><i>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</i></u>	policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.206	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.21	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.

FS118.164	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.74	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new policy:  <b><u>MUZ-PX Servicing</u></b>  <i><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></i>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the MUZ and ensures all land use activities in the MUZ are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.207	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.165	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.79	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new standard:  <b><u>MUZ-SX Servicing</u></b>  1. <i><u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></i>  2. <i><u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of</u></i>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<p><u>service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	
FS17.212	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.167	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.3-Objectives > 17.3.1-MUZ-O1 Purpose of the Mixed Use Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.282	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the stated purpose of the zone.
FS17.950	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS99.315	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.289	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.3-Objectives > 17.3.2-MUZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Mixed Use Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.283	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:	Generally supports this objective, which sets out the planned urban built environment of the MUZ but seeks changes to recognise that the anticipated urban built

			<p>The Mixed Use Zone is a vibrant, attractive safe urban built environment, that is characterised by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Medium-rise</del> buildings that contribute positively to and integrate well with the surrounding area;</li> <li>2. A greater intensity of built urban form in locations accessible to the <u>Metropolitan Centre Zone</u> or a train station, identified by height increase controls on the planning maps;</li> <li>3. <u>A range of buildings and sites that reflect a mix of activities;</u></li> <li>4. Sites and buildings used for residential purposes that provide good quality on-site residential amenity for the health and well-being of people residing in the Zone.</li> </ol>	<p>form will be greater than medium rise in many situations. In addition, seeks an additional arm to the policy, to clearly convey that the anticipated urban environment will comprise a mix of activities and associated built form.</p>
FS17.951	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS99.316	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude</p>

				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.290	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.3-Objectives > 17.3.3-MUZ-O3 Managing the scale of use and development at zone interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.16	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend MUZ O3 to read  <b><i>Managing the Scale of Development at Zone Interface</i></b> <i>Use and development within the Mixed-Use Zone:</i> <i>1. Is of an appropriate scale and proportion for the purpose and planned urban built environment of the zone; and</i> <i>2. Minimises adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites in Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones</i> <i>3. Sustains a healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects</i>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<i>and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</i>	
FS17.70	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.131	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD.
FS127.467	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.284	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the management of interface effects at zone boundaries.
FS17.952	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.317	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire



				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.291	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.35	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	<i>Managing the scale of use and development</i> at zone interface could mention the adverse effects on the SASMs under Clause 2, and not just the amenity values.	A site that is SASM might have been heavily modified, this should not give a potential development proposal, the licence to conduct further damage and undertake further mismanagement of the site.
FS17.563	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.426	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.36	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Policy MUZ-P11 Qualifying matters - effects on historic heritage and urban environment does not spell out the SASMs overlay, and it just refers to the historic heritage.	A site that is SASM might have been heavily modified, this should not give a potential development proposal, the licence to conduct further damage and undertake further mismanagement of the site.
FS17.564	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS127.427	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
-----------	---------------	---------	--	---

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.1-MUZ-P1

### Appropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.285	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.953	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.318	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.292	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.2-MUZ-P2

### Location of residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.286	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.954	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.319	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.293	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS78.8	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Support	Support	<p>Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.</p> <p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG), the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur</p>

				<p>infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p> <p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.</p>
FS17.1034	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

# 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.3-MUZ-P3

## Health and well-being for residential activity and residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.287	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><b>Health Amenity and well-being for residential activity and residential units</b></p> <p>Enable residential activity and residential units where they provide a <u>healthy quality</u> urban built environment that provides for people's <u>amenity and</u> well-being in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to sunlight, daylight and outdoor living space; and</li> <li>2. Privacy and site design</li> </ol>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought.
FS17.955	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.29	KiwiRail	Oppose	Reject submission and retain reference to health instead of amenity or include reference to amenity in addition to reference to health.	It is critical that buildings and structures meet the health needs of communities in addition to amenity and well-being. As Kainga Ora recognises in its submission, amenity values can change over time and

				therefore can be difficult quantify compared to health needs. The provisions as notified provide a clearer standard to be achieved by retaining reference to health. In the event amenity is included, reference to health should also be referenced.
FS99.320	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.294	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.4-MUZ-P4 Other activities



Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.72	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Provide for other activities within the Mixed Use Zone, including larger-scale activities where:</i>  ...  <i>4. There is a functional and operational need to locate in the area.</i>	Supports MUZ-P4 insofar as it provides for other activities within the MUZ. However, seeks provision for other activities where there is a functional and operational need for them to locate within the MUZ.
FS17.205	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.288	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.956	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.321	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions

				of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.295	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.118	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Delete MUZ-P4 as notified and replace with the following policies:</p> <p><b>Provision of housing for an ageing population</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</li> <li>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</li> <li>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>Changing communities</b></p> <p>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of</p>	Supports MUZ-P4 providing for retirement villages in the Mixed Use Zone. The policy is not sufficiently enabling and it opposes the proposed policy requirement for on-site amenity to be regulated. The reference to reverse sensitivity is covered by P2.

			<p>the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p><b>Larger sites</b></p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p> <p>Delete or amend other MUZ objectives and policies for consistency.</p>	
FS67.120	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.5-MUZ-P5 Inappropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.17	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	<p>Amend MUZ P5 to read:</p> <p><b><i>Inappropriate Activities</i></b>  <i>Avoid activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the Mixed-Use Zone <u>and which risk causing adverse effects on natural resources including:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>1. The adverse effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</u></i></p> <p><i><u>2. The adverse effects caused by excess and</u></i></p>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<u>contaminated run-off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</u> <u>3. The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</u>	
FS17.71	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.468	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.289	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.957	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.322	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.296	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.6-MUZ-P6 Small scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.290	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.958	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.323	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.297	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.7-MUZ-P7 Larger scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.291	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Provide for larger-scale built development that <u>reflects the planned urban built environment of the Mixed Use Zone where it can be demonstrated that the development contributes positive design outcomes taking into consideration the following design objectives as relevant to the specific site, development type, and the planned urban built environment of the zone:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Optimise the quality of the outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach.</u></li> <li><u>Provision is made for safe and convenient pedestrian movement.</u></li> </ol>	<p>Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought directly within the policy (which is the referenced matter of discretion against the relevant rule).</p> <p>Consistent with its broader submission, opposes the reference to a statutory design guide and seeks the relevant assessment matters instead be directly articulated in the relevant provision/matter of discretion. Would support the use of non-statutory design guides as a tool to inform assessment.</p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. <u>3. Servicing and parking is functional and maintains a high level of public realm amenity.</u></li><li>4. <u>4. Achieve visual interest and avoid visual monotony while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li><li>5. <u>5. Achieve integrated building top and roof design.</u></li><li>6. <u>6. Ensure materials and detailing are suitably robust and fit-for-purpose in order to maintain their appearance over time.</u></li><li>7. <u>7. Street edges are visually interesting and active, which contribute to the safety and attractiveness of their setting.</u></li><li>8. <u>8. Relevant sections of RESZ-P10 in regard to residential units and activities.</u></li></ol> <p><i><u>Note:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></i></p> <p>-</p> <p><u>that:</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><del>1. Acknowledges and reflects the planned urban built environment of the Mixed Use Zone; and</del></p> <p><del>2. Is consistent with the Mixed Use Zone Design Guide contained in APP5 – Mixed Use Zone Design Guide.</del></p>	
FS17.959	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.324	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.195	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (amendments to MUZ-P7) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.



FS127.298	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.8-MUZ-P8 Height increase

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.292	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
FS17.960	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.325	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.299	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.9-MUZ-P9 Public space interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.293	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.961	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.326	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.300	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.4-Policies > 17.4.10-MUZ-P10 Interface with Residential and Open Space Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.294	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.962	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.327	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.301	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.1-MUZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.295	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  3. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b>  Where:  1. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-R1-1.b.	Supports this rule framework but also seeks removal of reference to MUZ-S5 within the notification preclusion statement of Rule MUZ-R1 (3), as this standard is not addressed within MUZ-R1 and instead is addressed under MUZ-R19. This change is sought from an administrative perspective – Kāinga Ora would otherwise such a standard being precluded from limited notification.

			<p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters of discretion of the infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <u>MUZ-S2</u>, <u>MUZ-S3</u> or <u>MUZ-S6</u> is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</li> <li>• An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <u>MUZ-S4</u> or <u>MUZ-S5</u> is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</li> </ul>	
FS17.963	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.328	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance

				the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.302	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.119	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks that MUZ-R1 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:</p> <p><b>MUZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures</b></p> <p>1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The gross floor area of the new building or structure, or addition to an existing building or structure is no more than 450m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p>b. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-R1.a.</p>	<p>To provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>Supports MUZ-R1 and the permitting of new buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. If the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have</p>

		<p>Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in MUZ-P7.</p> <p><b>Notification:</b> An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly and limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p> <p>3. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-R1-1.b.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard. Notification: An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MUZ-S2, MUZ-S3 or MUZ-S6 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MUZ-S4 or MUZ-S5 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p> <p><b>4. Activity status: Retirement village</b> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-R1-1a or b.</u></p>	<p>from other residential activities). The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p><u>b. The application is for a retirement village. Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u></li> <li><u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></li> <li><u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></li> <li><u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></li> <li><u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 - 5, consider:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></li> <li><u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></li> </ol> </li> <li><u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></li> </ol> <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><b><u>Notification:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village where compliance is achieved with MUZ-S1, MUZ-S2 and MUZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</li> </ul>	
FS67.121	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.1-MUZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 17.5.1.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.75	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  ...  <u><i>MUZ-SX is complied with.</i></u>	Notes that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision consent, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the SUB – Subdivision chapter. Therefore, additional standards that will require the provision of firefighting water supply and access where development is not subject to subdivision provisions are requested.
FS17.208	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS118.166	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.
-----------	---	--------	----------------------------	--

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.14-MUZ-R14 Supported residential care activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.296	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity.
FS17.964	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.329	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.303	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.15-MUZ-R15

### Community corrections activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.6	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Support	Retain Rule MUZ-R15.	<p>Rule MUZ-R15 provides for “community corrections activity” as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use Zone. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Making community corrections activities permitted in the Mixed Use Zone addresses the Submitter’s primary submission on the PPDP seeking its inclusion.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>

# 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.18-MUZ-R18

## Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.297	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity and resulting rule framework where compliance is not achieved.
FS17.965	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.330	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.304	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	--

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.19-MUZ-R19 Residential activity and residential unit, ;excluding papakāinga > 17.5.19.1-1. Activity status: Permitted

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.298	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b>  Where:  <del>a. No more than three residential units occupy the site; and</del>  <del>b. a. Compliance is achieved with MUZ-S5</del>	Supports the preclusion to both limited and public notification in this rule framework. However, seeks no maximum threshold on the number of permitted units, and therefore seeks a change to this rule.
FS17.966	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.331	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.305	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.19-MUZ-R19 Residential activity and residential unit, ;excluding papakāinga > 17.5.19.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.299	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  <del>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</del>  Where:  1. <del>Compliance is not achieved with MUZ-R19-1.a.</del>	Supports the preclusion to both limited and public notification in this rule framework. However, seeks no maximum threshold on the number of permitted units, and therefore seeks a change to this rule.

			<p><del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del></p> <p>1. <del>The matters in <u>MUZ-P7</u>.</del></p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <p><del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</del></p> <p>[consequential changes to numbering]</p>	
FS17.967	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.332	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.306	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
--	--	--	--	--

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.20-MUZ-R21 Retirement village

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.120	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity (with the construction of a retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity under MUZ-R1).</p> <p><b>MUZ-R21 Retirement village</b>  1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del>  <b>Permitted</b>  Matters of discretion are restricted to:  1. The matters in MUZ-P4.  <b>Notification:</b></p> <p><del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</del></p>	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification or urban non-residential zones, the Mixed Use Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in all zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.
FS67.122	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	



## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.5-Rules > 17.5.23-MUZ-R24 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.76	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports MUZ-R24 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.209	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.1-MUZ-S1 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.77	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from MUZ-S1 and MUZ-S2 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers

FS17.210	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.300	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. All buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 18m; or</li> <li>2. 22m on sites subject to the Height Increase A identified on the planning maps; <del>or</del></li> <li>3. <del>12m on sites subject to Height Control—Heritage B shown on the planning maps.</del></li> </ol> <p>Consequential deletion of matters of discretion that refer to policies relevant to the matters being deleted.</p>	<p>Supports the height limit within the MUZ being consistent with heights of the immediately surrounding residential environment or commercial environment.</p> <p>Does not support the application of height controls on sites that adjoin identified heritage sites. Instead, would support the use of HIRB on boundaries adjoining sites with identified values. Seeks the deletion of height controls in relation to this matter and consequential amendments.</p>
FS17.968	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.128	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks that the controls on height to protect historic heritage are retained as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose deleting controls that restrict buildings heights adjacent to listed historic heritage sites as this would not give effect to the RPS. Operative RPS Policy 22 requires district plans to include policies, rules and other methods to protect significant heritage values from inappropriate development. PCC has identified that specified historic heritage sites are at risk of potentially significant adverse effects if a qualifying matter is not included to restrict intensified

				development. Greater Wellington support the qualifying matter and associated height controls to protect heritage values.
FS99.333	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.307	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.2-MUZ-S2 Height in relation to boundary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.78	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from MUZ-S1 and MUZ-S2 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers
FS17.211	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.301	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	supports this standard
FS17.969	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.334	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.308	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.3-MUZ-S3 Setback

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS72.8	KiwiRail	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p>2. Buildings and structures must not be located within a <del>1.5m</del> <u>5m</u> setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</p>	<p>The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will:</p> <p>(a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;</p> <p>(b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;</p> <p>(c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district;</p> <p>(d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and</p>

				preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure; (e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.
FS17.305	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.375	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as the proposed 1.5m set back provides 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.
OS76.302	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.970	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.335	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of

				design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.309	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.4-MUZ-S4 Active street frontage

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.303	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.971	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.336	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.310	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.5-MUZ-S5 Outdoor living space

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.304	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.972	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.337	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the



				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.311	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 17-MUZ - Mixed Use Zone > 17.6-Standards > 17.6.6-MUZ-S6 Screening and landscaping of service areas, outdoor storage areas and parking areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.305	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.973	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.338	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.312	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 18-CCZ- City Centre Zone > 18.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS23.1	James Baigent	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Strongly support housing intensification in the city centre. The city centre is a wasteland at night and having more people living among it and close to it will be transformative. The city centre has infrastructure and services already in place and the environmental impact of significant housing intensification in Porirua CBD would be limited.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.29	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Increase height limit to 53m.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.697	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.12	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area

				<p>which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&amp;T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building (see Appendix 2). Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with the proposed district plan zones.</p>
FS75.52	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in</p>

				finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.62	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.36	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.31	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Alter activity status of some activities to reflect change in zoning. [For area rezoned from LFRZ to MCZ).  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.699	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.50	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.64	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.38	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.32	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revisions to notification preclusion statements.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as</li> </ul>

				<p>to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.700	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.49	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.65	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude



				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.39	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.33	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Revised provisions to clarify intended design outcomes.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul>

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.701	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.48	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.66	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.40	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.307	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Retain the MCZ as notified.	Generally supports the use of the MCZ; although Kāinga Ora is seeking expansion to the zone to replace the LFRZ at the north of the city centre.
FS17.975	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.340	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.314	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.309	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	It is acknowledged that this includes the area identified as the Whitireia Tertiary Education Precinct, which is also sought to be rehoused into the MCZ, with consequential changes to provisions to reflect the shift in chapters.	Generally supports the use of the MCZ; although Kāinga Ora is seeking expansion to the zone to replace the LFRZ at the north of the city centre.
FS17.977	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.342	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.316	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.310	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Consequential amendments will be required as a result of submission and changes to the planning maps.	Generally supports the use of the MCZ; although Kāinga Ora is seeking expansion to the zone to replace the LFRZ at the north of the city centre.
FS17.978	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.343	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.317	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.311	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified [chapter introduction]	Generally supports the introduction statement to the LCZ.

FS17.979	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.344	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.318	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.333	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Amendments sought:  Relocate Whitireia Tertiary Education Precinct from LFRZ to the MCZ, with all consequential changes.	Seeks the relocation of the Whitireia Tertiary Education Precinct from the LFRZ to the MCZ, with consequential updates to the precinct provisions and the MCZ chapter to reflect the rehousing of this precinct.

FS17.1001	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.366	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.340	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.81	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new objective:	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Metropolitan Centre Zone and

			<p><b><u>MCZ-OX Infrastructure</u></b></p> <p><u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></p>	<p>ensures all land use activities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.</p>
FS17.214	Leigh Subritzky	Support	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.</p>
FS72.22	KiwiRail	Support	<p>Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.</p>	<p>While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue</p>



				and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.
FS118.168	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.82	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new policy:  <b><u>MCZ-PX Servicing</u></b>  <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Metropolitan Centre Zone and ensures all land use activities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.215	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.169	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.86	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new standard:  <b><u>MCZ-SX Servicing</u></b>  1. <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<p>2. <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	
FS17.219	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.176	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.3-Objectives > 19.3.1-MCZ-O1 Purpose of the Metropolitan Centre Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.312	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the stated purpose of the zone.
FS17.980	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.345	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.319	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS114.29	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	MCZ-O1 and MCZ-O2 could reflect these goals that the NPS-UD is, in essence, trying to achieve when the intensification and densification proposals were released. However, it is quite difficult to separate and identify these goals in the objectives of the MCZ. Whilst the Zone Chapter does a good job to explain how the MCZ is significant in terms of commercial, community, recreational, and residential activities which is describing what Porirua Metropolitan City Centre looks like right now; this is not acknowledging or explaining the reasons as to realising intensification and densification.	The objectives of the MCZ, akin to other Zone Chapters, do not adequately reflect the socio-environmental goals and how District Plan will shape and influence the behaviour around building, travelling, commercial activities and so on.
FS17.557	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.420	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.3-Objectives > 19.3.2-MCZ-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.18	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend MCZ O2 to read:  <b><i>Planned urban built environment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone</i></b> <i>The planned urban built environment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone is characterised</i>	To have requirements that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<p>by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A built form that is compact and reflects the high-density environment of the Metropolitan Centre</li> <li>2. A built environment that is versatile, well designed and of high quality and contributes to attractive and safe public spaces; and</li> <li>3. An urban environment that is an attractive place to live, work and visit</li> <li>4. An urban environment that sustains a <u>healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u></li> </ol>	
FS17.72	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.469	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.313	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the planned urban built environment of the zone.
FS17.981	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.346	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.320	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.30	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	MCZ-O1 and MCZ-O2 could reflect these goals that the NPS-UD is, in essence, trying to achieve when the intensification and densification proposals were released. However, it is quite difficult to separate and identify these goals in the objectives of the MCZ. Whilst the Zone Chapter does a good job to explain how the MCZ is significant in terms of commercial, community, recreational, and residential activities which is describing what Porirua Metropolitan City Centre looks like right now; this is not acknowledging or explaining the reasons as to realising intensification and densification.	The objectives of the MCZ, akin to other Zone Chapters, do not adequately reflect the socio-environmental goals and how District Plan will shape and influence the behaviour around building, travelling, commercial activities and so on.

FS17.558	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.421	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.1-MCZ-P1 Appropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.314	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.982	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.347	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is

				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.321	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.2-MCZ-P2 Location of residential activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.315	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy.
FS17.983	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.348	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood



				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.322	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.3-MCZ-P3 Health and well-being for residential activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.316	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p><b>Health Amenity and well-being for residential activity and residential units</b></p> <p>Ensure residential activity and residential units achieve a <u>healthy quality</u> urban built environment that provides for people's amenity and well-being in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to sunlight, daylight and outdoor living space; and</li> <li>2. Privacy and site design.</li> </ol>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought.

FS17.984	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.349	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.323	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.4-MCZ-P4 Other activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.80	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:  <i>Provide for other activities within the Metropolitan Centre Zone where:</i>  ...  <i><u>5. There is a functional and operational need to locate in the area.</u></i>	Supports MCZ-P4 insofar as it provides for other activities within the MCZ. However, seeks provision for other activities where there is a functional and operational need for them to locate within the MCZ.
FS17.213	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.317	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Provide for other activities including larger-scale activities where:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any significant adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated;</li> <li>2. The activity is consistent with the planned urban built environment and purpose of the zone;</li> <li>3. For any retirement village: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. On-site amenity for residents is provided, which reflects the nature of and diverse needs of residents of the village;<del>and</del></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to remove explicit mention to reverse sensitivity effects, as this is separately managed through the District Wide noise chapter.

			4. <del>Any potential reverse sensitivity effects on the continued operation of non-residential activities are minimised.</del>	
FS17.985	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.350	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.324	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS78.7	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ	Support	Support	Council, as a Tier 1 authority, is required to implement the intensification policies of the NPS: UD and Medium Density

	<p>Limited &amp; Mobil Oil NZ Limited</p>			<p>Residential Standards (MDRS) to enable greater housing choice throughout the district. As such, Variation 1 to the PDP proposes a comprehensive upzoning of most residential areas in Porirua to enable higher density housing typologies. Variation 1 also proposes higher residential densities in the Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Mixed-Use zones in addition to several amendments to various PDP chapters to give effect to these higher order documents.</p> <p>Retail fuel activities in the district are located in a range of zones. It is also common for sites to be located on or near the edge of zones. These existing activities include the storage and use of hazardous substances (namely petrol, diesel, and LPG), the refuelling of vehicles, and often other vehicle services (air pump, car wash etc.), and ancillary retail. Fuel deliveries are undertaken via tankers which occur infrequently but often without restriction in terms of frequency or times. All sites have established vehicle crossings for access and exit, buildings, and signage (often illuminated). Pump stations are located beneath a forecourt canopy which is usually lit via under canopy lighting. Hours of operation vary and are not infrequently 24/7. The Fuel Companies' sites operate in accordance with Emergency Management Plans detailing procedures in case of</p>
--	---	--	--	---

				<p>emergency, including spills of hazardous substances. While these activities can and do occur appropriately in a range of environments/zones, the perceived acceptability of potential adverse effects can be influenced by the intensity and nature of adjoining activities.</p> <p>The proposed higher densities in the residential and commercial zones are not opposed, but the ongoing operation of retail fuel activities should not be compromised by reverse sensitivity effects resulting from the proposed increase in residential densities, including nuisance effects (e.g. noise) and adverse amenity effects, irrespective of existing and future operations being lawful. For example, a new high density multi storey Mixed-Use development adjoining an existing service station increases the likelihood of perceived noise and lighting effects. This is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.</p> <p>Intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are therefore neutral to them. Standards are important to manage potential effects of the same, for instance in relation to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation. Support expressed for the proposed changes to NOISE-R4, NOISE-S5 and NOISE-S6 which prescribe specific acoustic requirements for habitable rooms associated with more noise sensitive activities (e.g. supported residential care and retirement villages) in commercial and industrial zones. The proposed changes will give effect to policies LCZ-P2, LCZ-P4, NCZ-P2, MCZ-P4, MUZ-P2 and MUZ-P4 which, inter alia, seek to minimise reverse sensitive effects on existing commercial activities.
FS17.1033	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS118.121	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Delete MCZ-P4 and replace with the following policies:</p> <p><b>Provision of housing for an ageing population</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</li> <li>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</li> <li>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Supports MCZ-P4 providing for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone. The policy is sufficiently enabling and it opposes the proposed policy requirement for on-site amenity to be regulated.

			<p>needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p><b>Changing communities</b> To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p><b>Larger sites</b> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p> <p>Delete or amend other MCZ objectives and policies for consistency.</p>	
FS67.123	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.5-MCZ-P5 Inappropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.19	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	<p>Amend MCZ P5 to read:</p> <p><b><i>Inappropriate Activities</i></b> <i>Avoid activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the Metropolitan Centre</i></p>	To have requirements in the Plan that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.



			<p><u>Zone and which risk causing adverse effects on natural resources including:</u></p> <p><u>1. The adverse effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</u></p> <p><u>2. The adverse effects caused by excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</u></p> <p><u>3. The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</u></p>	
FS17.73	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.470	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS76.318	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.986	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.351	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.325	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.6-MCZ-P6 Small scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.319	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this policy.
FS17.987	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.352	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude

				of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.326	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.7-MCZ-P7 Large scale built development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.320	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend:  Provide for larger-scale built development that <u>reflects the planned urban built environment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone where it can be demonstrated that the development contributes positive design outcomes taking into consideration the following design objectives as relevant to the specific site, development type, and the planned urban built environment of the zone:</u>	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks change to more clearly articulate the outcomes sought directly within the policy (which is the referenced matter of discretion against the relevant rule).  Consistent with its broader submission, opposes the reference to a statutory design guide and seeks the relevant assessment matters instead be directly articulated in the relevant provision/matter of discretion. Kāinga Ora would support the use of non-statutory design guides as a tool to inform assessment.

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <u>Optimise the quality of the outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach.</u></li><li>2. <u>Buildings spatially define street edges in order to contribute to a high-quality public realm.</u></li><li>3. <u>Provision is made for safe and convenient pedestrian movement.</u></li><li>4. <u>Servicing and parking is functional and maintains a high level of public realm amenity.</u></li><li>5. <u>Provide for reasonable light, outlook, and internal amenity for occupied internal spaces.</u></li><li>6. <u>Achieve visual interest and avoid visual monotony while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li><li>7. <u>Achieve integrated building top and roof design.</u></li><li>8. <u>Ensure materials and detailing are suitably robust and fit-for-purpose in order to maintain their appearance over time.</u></li><li>9. <u>Street edges are visually interesting and active, which contribute to the safety and attractiveness of their setting.</u></li><li>10. <u>Where applicable, the connection to the Porirua Stream is enhanced and potential impacts on the openness and historical and cultural values of the stream are addressed.</u></li></ol>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>11. <u>Relevant sections of RESZ-P10 in regard to residential units and activities.</u></p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></p> <p>that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Acknowledges and reflects the planned urban built environment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone; and</del></li> <li>2. <del>Is consistent with the Metropolitan Centre Zone Design Guide contained in APP4 Metropolitan Centre Zone Design Guide.</del></li> </ol>	
FS17.988	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.353	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.327	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.31	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Policy MCZ-P7 Large Scale Built Development is expected to follow design guides only where applicable enhances the connection to the Porirua Stream and addresses potential impacts on the openness and historical and cultural values of the stream. Given that all Porirua, especially some parts of MCZ is very significant sites to Tangata Whenua, and the shoreline wasn't where it was today, it is important the clause 3 is stronger and every large scale built development has assessed how they are meeting the aspirations of iwi and Tangata Whenua.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested – refer to original submission]
FS17.559	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.422	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.8-MCZ-P8 Public space interface

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.321	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this policy
FS17.989	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.354	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.328	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

# 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.4-Policies > 19.4.9-MCZ-P9 Car parking and parking lots

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.322	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Only allow for ground level car parking and parking lots where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not located along a primary frontage identified on the planning maps;</li> <li>2. Any adverse effects on the amenity and quality of the streetscape and public open spaces can be minimised; and</li> <li>3. <del>The design and layout of</del> <del>a</del>Any parking lot <u>fulfils the intent of the relevant outcomes and objectives noted in MCZ-P7. is consistent with the Metropolitan Centre Zone Design Guide contained in APP4-</u> <del>Metropolitan Centre Zone Design Guide.</del></li> </ol> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u></p>	Seeks changes to this policy to remove reference to the proposed statutory design guide. Instead, reference is made to the guiding design related policy MCZ-P7 (as amended by Kāinga Ora).



FS17.990	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.355	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.329	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.32	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	It seems that Policy MCZ-P9 is at odds with the NPS-UD parking requirements. Ground level parking is still parking?
FS17.560	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.423	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses

				significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
--	--	--	--	---

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.1-MCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.323	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. Compliance is not achieved with MCZ-R1-1.b.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters of discretion of the infringed standard.</p>	<p>Supports this rule framework but also seeks preclusion to limited notification. In addition, seeks removal of reference to MCZ-S4 within the notification preclusion statement of Rule MCZ-R1 (3), as this standard is not addressed within MCZ-R1 and instead is addressed under MCZ-R12.</p>

			<p><b>Notification:</b></p> <p>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with <a href="#">MCZ-S2</a>, <a href="#">MCZ-S3</a>, <del><a href="#">MCZ-S4</a></del>, <a href="#">MCZ-S5</a>, or <a href="#">MCZ-S6</a> is precluded from being publicly <b>and limited</b> notified in accordance with sections <a href="#">95A</a> and <a href="#">95B</a> of the RMA.</p>	
FS17.991	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.356	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.330	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS118.122	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks that MCZ-R1 is amended as follows to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:</p> <p><b>MCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures</b></p> <p>1. Activity status: <b>Permitted</b> Where:</p> <p>a. The gross floor area of the new building or structure, or addition to an existing building or structure is no more than 450m<sup>2</sup>; and</p> <p>b. Compliance is achieved with:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where:</p> <p>b. Compliance is not achieved with MCZ-R1.a. Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>1. The matters in MCZ-P7.</p> <p><b>Notification:</b> An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly and limited notified in accordance with sections 95A and 95B of the RMA.</p> <p>3. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b> Where:</p> <p>a. Compliance is not achieved with MCZ-R1-1.b.</p>	<p>To provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The Mixed Use Zone is in conflict with the MDRS and needs to be amended as part of the Variation and Plan Change. Supports MCZ-R1 and the permitting of new buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. If the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement</p>
-----------	---	-------	---	--

		<p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</li> </ol> <p><b>Notification:</b> An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with MCZ-S2, MCZ-S3, MCZ-S4, MCZ-S5, or MCZ-S6 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</p> <p><b>4. Activity status: <u>Restricted discretionary</u></b> <b>Where:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Compliance is not achieved with MCZ-R1-1a or b.</u></li> <li>b. <u>The application is for a retirement village.</u></li> </ol> <p><b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</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>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></li> <li>5. <u>When assessing the matters in 1 - 5, consider:</u></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p>6. <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><b>Notification:</b>  <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>  <u>An application under this rule that is associated with a retirement village where compliance is achieved with MCZ-S1 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>	
FS67.124	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

**19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.1-MCZ-R1 New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and additions to existing buildings and structures > 19.5.1.1-1.**  
**Activity status: Permitted**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.83	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend:	Notes that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision consent, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the SUB –

			<p><i>Activity status: Permitted</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>MCZ-SX is complied with.</i></p>	<p>Subdivision chapter. Therefore, additional standards that will require the provision of firefighting water supply and access where development is not subject to subdivision provisions are requested</p>
FS17.216	Leigh Subritzky	Support	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.</p>
FS118.175	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Disallow submission point.</p>	<p>The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.</p>

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.12-MCZ-R12 Residential activity > 19.5.12.2-2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.324	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>2. Activity status: <b>Restricted discretionary</b></p> <p>Where:</p>	<p>Supports the permitted activity status noting no maximum unit threshold applies. Kāinga Ora supports the requirement for residential units to be located above ground floor in the MCZ and supports the preclusion of public notification. Seeks preclusion to limited notification in instances when MCZ-S4 (location of residential units) is not met, noting that the</p>

			<p>1. Compliance is not achieved with <a href="#">MCZ-S4</a>.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to</p> <p>1. The matters of discretion of the infringed standard.</p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly <b>and limited</b> notified in accordance with sections <b>95A and 95B</b> of the RMA.</p>	<p>effect being managed is one of streetscape amenity and public realm considerations, and the ability to reuse and adapt ground floor tenancies. These are not matters that would require input from affected parties.</p>
FS17.992	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS99.357	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire</p>



				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.331	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.13-MCZ-R13 Supported residential care activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.325	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the permitted activity status applying to this activity.
FS17.993	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.358	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.332	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.14-MCZ-R14 Community corrections activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.7	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Support	Retain Rule MCZ-R14.	<p>Rule MCZ-R14 provides for “community corrections activity” as a permitted activity in the Metropolitan Centre Zone (previously the City Centre Zone). Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They build strong and resilient communities and enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Making community corrections activities permitted in the Metropolitan Centre Zone addresses the Submitter’s primary submission on the PPDP seeking its inclusion in the previously proposed equivalent City Centre Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.17-MCZ-R17 Papakāinga

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.33	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	<p>MCZ-R17 regarding papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, the minimum gross floor areas are not specified. Te Rūnanga are curious as to why they were not included. As commented in the other parts of the Plan, addressing Porirua Stream (MCZ-S3) should not be just about the buildings and their orientation as well as their proven connection.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.561	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.424	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

# 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.18-MCZ-R18 Large format retail activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.326	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Amend:  1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del> <u>Permitted</u>  <del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del>  <del>The matters in MCZ-P4.</del>	As a consequential change to seeking the removal of the LFRZ at the northern end of the city, Kāinga Ora seeks a permitted activity status for Large Format Retail activities apply in the MRZ.
FS17.994	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.359	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is

				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.333	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.19-MCZ-R19 Supermarket

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.327	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del> <b><u>Permitted</u></b></p> <p><del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del></p> <p><del>The matters in <u>MCZ-P4</u>.</del></p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p>	As a consequential change to seeking the removal of the LFRZ at the northern end of the city, Kāinga Ora seeks a permitted activity status for supermarket activities apply in the MRZ.

			<del>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</del>	
FS17.995	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.360	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.334	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.20-MCZ-R20 Emergency service facility

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.84	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as drafted.	Supports MCZ-R20 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.217	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.21-MCZ-R21 Retirement village

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.123	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity (with the construction of a retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity under MCZ-R1).</p> <p><b>MCZ-R21 Retirement village</b>                      1. Activity status: <del>Restricted discretionary</del>  <b><u>Permitted</u></b></p>	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however recognising that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones, with councils required to ensure district plans provide for intensification or urban non-residential zones, the Metropolitan Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity),



			<del>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</del> 1. The matters in MCZ P4.	recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in all zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.
FS67.125	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.5-Rules > 19.5.25-MCZ-R25 Drive-through activity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.328	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Amend: 1. Activity status: <b>Discretionary Permitted</b>	As a consequential change to seeking the removal of the LFRZ at the northern end of the city, Kāinga Ora seeks a permitted activity status for drive-through activities in the MRZ.
FS17.996	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.361	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.335	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.1-MCZ-S1 Height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.85	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from MCZ-S1 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers.
FS17.218	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS76.329	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Amend:  1. All buildings and structures must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of <del>53m</del> 50m.	Generally supports the planned urban built environment of the MCZ but seeks a slight increase in the height from 50m to 53m to accommodate a 15 storey building more readily.
FS17.997	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.362	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.336	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.29	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports a higher density of urban built form in the Metropolitan Centre Zone in accordance with Policy 3 (b) of the NPS-UD.

FS17.1063	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
-----------	-----------------	--------	--	---

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.2-MCZ-S2 Active street frontages

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.330	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.998	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.363	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.337	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
-----------	---------------	--------	--	---

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.3-MCZ-S3 Addressing Porirua Stream

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.331	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.999	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.364	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.338	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS114.34	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	MCZ-R17 regarding papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, the minimum gross floor areas are not specified. Te Rūnanga are curious as to why they were not included. As commented in the other parts of the Plan, addressing Porirua Stream (MCZ-S3) should not be just about the buildings and their orientation as well as their proven connection.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.562	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.425	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 19-MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone > 19.6-Standards > 19.6.4-MCZ-S4 Location of residential units

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.332	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Retain as notified	Supports this standard
FS17.1000	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.365	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.339	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS84.2	Oyster Management Limited	Not Stated	Supports the amendments to the provisions in the General Industrial zone in Variation 1 where those provisions: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) are consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA); (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) are consistent with sound resource management practice.	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.1106	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS114.56	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Expand on the Objectives and Policies of the General Industrial Zone that speaks to the interactions with the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASMs) located in the General Industrial Zone, i.e., the streams.	Proposed Chapter acknowledges that the industrial zone is close to key freight routes, accommodates large yards, houses utilitarian buildings, and supports economic development in Porirua.  The objectives related to this Chapter are descriptive. For instance, ' <i>Planned urban environment of the General Industrial Zone</i> ' cannot be an objective as the area is simply not just an urban environment.



				<p>There is no reference or mention of streams and vegetation that has interactions with the General Industrial Zone. The policies associated with the Zone do not acknowledge this interaction either; GIZ-P2, for instance, doesn't mention 'inappropriate use and development' of General Industrial Zone would be undertaking activities that would impact on awa, moana, and ngāhere.</p> <p>A good example is Mitchell Stream that is in the industrial zone and has interface between a designated Landfill.</p>
FS17.584	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.447	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.87	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	<p>Add a new objective:</p> <p><b><u>GIZ-OX Infrastructure</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u></b></p>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the General Industrial Zone and ensures all land use activities in the General Industrial Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard

				sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.220	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS72.23	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part to the extent alternative wording would be consistent with the relief sought by KiwiRail.	While KiwiRail agrees that good planning outcomes will ensure public health and safety is protected, in many cases national or regionally significant infrastructure is already established and inappropriate development near the rail corridor can give rise to public health and safety issues. We anticipate FENZ intends for this objective to apply in the context of ensuring development is well serviced by infrastructure needed for fire emergency services, the wording of the objective applies to all infrastructure and can be read to place an onus on infrastructure providers to demonstrate "appropriate provision" for maintaining public health and safety. In cases where development is seeking to locate near the rail corridor the onus should be on those developers to implement measures to ensure their development occurs in a way that maintains public health and safety. KiwiRail would support alternative wording for this new objective which appropriately recognises this issue and is consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission.
FS118.179	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has

				objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.88	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new policy:  <b><u>GIZ-PX Servicing</u></b>  <i><u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u></i>	Seeks new objective and policy that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the General Industrial Zone and ensures all land use activities in the General Industrial Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.221	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.180	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as the new objective and policy sought are unnecessary and the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.
OS58.93	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a new standard:  <b><u>GIZ-SX Servicing</u></b>  1. <i><u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></i>  2. <i><u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and</u></i>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<p><u>satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	
FS17.226	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.178	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.3-Objectives > 20.3.1-GIZ-O1 Purpose of the General Industrial Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.20	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	<p>Amend GIZ O1 to read:</p> <p><b><i>Purpose of the General Industrial Zone</i></b>  <i>The General Industrial Zone accommodates a range of industry-based employment and economic development opportunities that:</i></p> <p><i>1. Support the wellbeing and prosperity of Porirua City; and</i></p>	To have requirements in the Plan that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.

			<p><i>2. Do not compromise the purpose of the Metropolitan Centre Zone or other Commercial and Mixed Use Zones;</i></p> <p><i>3. <u>Sustain a healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u></i></p>	
FS17.74	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.471	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.3-Objectives > 20.3.2-GIZ-O2 Planned urban environment of the General Industrial Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS114.6	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Redrafting of this objective so that it does not lack the articulation of environmental connections and interface with Te Taiao.	<p>Proposed Chapter acknowledges that the industrial zone is close to key freight routes, accommodates large yards, houses utilitarian buildings, and supports economic development in Porirua.</p> <p>The objectives related to this Chapter are descriptive. For instance, '<i>Planned urban environment of the General Industrial Zone</i>' cannot be an objective as the area is simply not just an urban environment.</p>

				<p>There is no reference or mention of streams and vegetation that has interactions with the General Industrial Zone. The policies associated with the Zone do not acknowledge this interaction either; GIZ-P2, for instance, doesn't mention 'inappropriate use and development' of General Industrial Zone would be undertaking activities that would impact on awa, moana, and ngāhere.</p> <p>A good example is Mitchell Stream that is in the industrial zone and has interface between a designated Landfill.</p>
FS17.534	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.101	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow	<p>Support an amendment to redraft the objective on planned urban environment of the general industrialised zone so that it articulates environmental connections and interface with Te Taiao,</p> <p>Industrial areas are not just places to transact business. They are inhabited by people for large parts of the day and night who deserve to work in areas in harmony with the natural environment. As the submitter has highlighted, streams and vegetation are located in industrial zones and it is every bit as important to respect the awa, moana and ngāhere there as well as in residential zones.</p>
FS127.397	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses

				significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
--	--	--	--	---

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.4-Policies > 20.4.1-GIZ-P1 Appropriate use and development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.21	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend GIZ P1 to read:  <b><i>Appropriate Use and Development</i></b> <i>Allow use and development that is compatible with the purpose and urban built environment of the General Industrial Zone and which do not risk causing adverse effects on natural resources including:</i> <i><u>1. The adverse effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</u></i> <i><u>2. The adverse effects caused by excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</u></i> <i><u>3. The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants, and nutrients.</u></i>	To have requirements in the Plan that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.
FS17.75	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.472	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

**20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.5-Rules > 20.5.1-GIZ-R1**  
**New buildings and structures, and alterations, repairs and**  
**additions to existing buildings and structures > 20.5.1.1-1.**  
**Activity status: Permitted**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.89	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend as follows:  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  ...  <i>GIZ-SX is complied with.</i>	Notes that there will be cases that developments will not require subdivision consent, and therefore will not be subject to the water supply provisions of the SUB – Subdivision chapter. Therefore, additional standards that will require the provision of firefighting water supply and access where development is not subject to subdivision provisions are requested.
FS17.222	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.177	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in Variation 1.

**20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.5-Rules > 20.5.14-GIZ-R14**  
**Emergency service facility**



Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.90	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports GIZ-R14 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate anywhere within this zone.
FS17.223	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.6-Standards > 20.6.1-GIZ-S1 Building height

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.91	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Amend:  ...  <i>This standard does not apply to:</i>  ...  <i>x. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</i>	Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.  As such, FENZ seeks an exclusion from GIZ-S1 for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers
FS17.224	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 20-GIZ - General Industrial Zone > 20.6-Standards > 20.6.6-GIZ-S6 Fences and standalone walls

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS58.92	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amend:</p> <p>1. <i>All fences and standalone walls must not exceed a maximum height above ground level of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 1.2m for the length of the site boundary where that boundary is located between the front of a principal building and a Broken Hill road; and</u></li> <li>b. <u>exceed a maximum height above ground level of 2m for site boundaries that adjoins a Residential Zone or Open Space and Recreation Zone.</u></li> <li>c. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u></li> </ul>	<p>The erection of fences and walls must not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ.</p>
FS17.225	Leigh Subritzky	Support	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.</p>

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS11.2	Paul Clegg	Amend	Retain provisions to maintain and enhance Significant Natural Areas	It is essential to protect and restore the natural environment to support future generations and develop communities that are as resilient to climate change as possible. This requires a better balance between paving and buildings and natural areas. A recent report <a href="https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods">https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods</a> showed Auckland was 50 % green (vegetation) or blue (ponds and streams) excluding harbours. If this proportion is possible for Auckland it should also be possible for a greenfields development in Porirua.
FS17.25	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.17	Alan Collett	Support	Support green belts around existing residential areas and these green belts should encompass areas already identified by PCC as natural areas of significance.	Support all of these submissions in relation to protection, enhancement and maintaining natural areas, waterways and areas of ecological significance. Pukerua Bay and areas within the Northern Growth area are seeing the development of bird life and flora and fauna that would come under threat by these proposed changes.
FS127.2	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS11.3	Paul Clegg	Amend	Retain provisions relating to Freshwater Management Areas.	It is essential to protect and restore the natural environment to support future generations and develop communities that are as resilient to

				climate change as possible. This requires a better balance between paving and buildings and natural areas. A recent report <a href="https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods">https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods</a> showed Auckland was 50 % green (vegetation) or blue (ponds and streams) excluding harbours. If this proportion is possible for Auckland it should also be possible for a greenfields development in Porirua.
FS17.26	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.16	Alan Collett	Support	Support green belts around existing residential areas and these green belts should encompass areas already identified by PCC as natural areas of significance.	Support all of these submissions in relation to protection, enhancement and maintaining natural areas, waterways and areas of ecological significance. Pukerua Bay and areas within the Northern Growth area are seeing the development of bird life and flora and fauna that would come under threat by these proposed changes.
FS127.3	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS11.4	Paul Clegg	Amend	Strengthen requirements to create buffer areas around SNAs and create ecological connections so that these become non-negotiable.	It is essential to protect and restore the natural environment to support future generations and develop communities that are as resilient to climate change as possible. This requires a better balance between paving and buildings and natural areas. A recent report <a href="https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods">https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods</a> showed Auckland was 50 % green (vegetation) or blue (ponds and streams)

				excluding harbours. If this proportion is possible for Auckland it should also be possible for a greenfields development in Porirua.
FS17.27	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.15	Alan Collett	Support	Support green belts around existing residential areas and these green belts should encompass areas already identified by PCC as natural areas of significance.	Support all of these submissions in relation to protection, enhancement and maintaining natural areas, waterways and areas of ecological significance. Pukerua Bay and areas within the Northern Growth area are seeing the development of bird life and flora and fauna that would come under threat by these proposed changes.
FS127.4	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS11.5	Paul Clegg	Amend	Require natural vegetation and waterways including constructed wetlands or other FMAs to make up 50 % of the development area.	It is essential to protect and restore the natural environment to support future generations and develop communities that are as resilient to climate change as possible. This requires a better balance between paving and buildings and natural areas. A recent report <a href="https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods">https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20220823-how-auckland-worlds-most-spongy-city-tackles-floods</a> showed Auckland was 50 % green (vegetation) or blue (ponds and streams) excluding harbours. If this proportion is possible for Auckland it should also be possible for a greenfields development in Porirua.
FS17.28	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS99.14	Alan Collett	Support	Support green belts around existing residential areas and these green belts should encompass areas already identified by PCC as natural areas of significance.	Support all of these submissions in relation to protection, enhancement and maintaining natural areas, waterways and areas of ecological significance. Pukerua Bay and areas within the Northern Growth area are seeing the development of bird life and flora and fauna that would come under threat by these proposed changes.
FS127.5	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS11.6	Paul Clegg	Amend	Add a requirement that no development is undertaken until the new access to SH 59 is in place.	<p>Muri Road is currently one lane for much of its length and is completely unsuitable for any increase in traffic volume. Even the supposedly two-lane section between the Sea Vista drive intersection and number 9 is barely wide enough, with a steep bank on one side. The road surface is also breaking up in this section because vehicles have to drive off the side of the seal to avoid oncoming traffic.</p> <p>The supporting document report from Tim Kelly transportation planning says that an upgrade of Muri Road is planned as part of the Stage 1 Muri Road development. Residents have not been provided any information about this plan. Any changes need to be carefully planned to minimise disruption of SNAs and limit environmental impacts as well as addressing road safety.</p>
FS17.29	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS127.6	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS11.7	Paul Clegg	Amend	Add a requirement that residents must be consulted about any planned upgrades to Muri Road to enable safe access to the north of the site.	<p>Muri Road is currently one lane for much of its length and is completely unsuitable for any increase in traffic volume. Even the supposedly two-lane section between the Sea Vista drive intersection and number 9 is barely wide enough, with a steep bank on one side. The road surface is also breaking up in this section because vehicles have to drive off the side of the seal to avoid oncoming traffic.</p> <p>The supporting document report from Tim Kelly transportation planning says that an upgrade of Muri Road is planned as part of the Stage 1 Muri Road development. Residents have not been provided any information about this plan. Any changes need to be carefully planned to minimise disruption of SNAs and limit environmental impacts as well as addressing road safety.</p>
FS17.30	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.7	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS27.1	Pukerua Holdings Limited	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Ko Simon Barber toku ingoa. I tipu ake ahau i Pukerua Bay. He tikanga motuhake enei puke ki ahau. Kei te harikoa ahau ki te whakapuaki i tenei waahi ki te katoa o te haponi.

				Extremely encouraged by the proactive engagement with Tangata Whenua and Ngati Toa Rangitira's willingness to build a collaborative approach to this development. Looks forward to further engagement throughout the consenting phase and as we enter the construction programme enabling the iwi's ongoing involvement.
FS17.603	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS22.2	On Behalf of landowner SS Pointon	Support	Allow the whole submission	Support the submission by Pukerua Holdings Ltd (submitter 27) for the creation of the NGA. The support of the submitter is that it would be successful enable our submission to extend to extend the NGA area to include our land achievable.
OS27.2	Pukerua Holdings Limited	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Owens of the Muri Road block, 128 hectares of the northernmost land holding of the Northern Growth Area Development Plan Change. Fully supports the proposed Plan Variation and the outcomes identified in providing for a Porirua city community that is expected to grow exponentially in the next 30 years by over 40%. Been in the construction industry for over 35 years, built a strong reputation as a land developer and residential home builder. Ideally positioned, with subsidiaries Jennian Homes Wellington and Milestone Homes Kapiti, to undertake and manage an end-to-end process to deliver a product that will leave a legacy for



				<p>the Porirua region.</p> <p>The development, which will be involved in for the next 15-20 years, will significantly benefit the wider Porirua region both economically and socially. It will positively impact housing supply in the region, so desperately needed.</p> <p>The Muri Road block is beautifully positioned land with a north-west elevated aspect and superb ecological features with native bush and wetlands.</p> <p>The Vision for Muri Road is to enhance the natural ecological state, whilst unlocking the land to enable residential living and accessibility to the prime native bush and wetlands for the enjoyment of the community, leaving a legacy for generations to come.</p> <p>Notably, this will be supported by various modes of transport as part of a spine that links to a transport hub, centred by the Pukerua Bay train station, situated just 250 metres from the site – unique in an urban environment setting. Strategically, this area has been earmarked for residential development for some time as signalled in the Porirua Development Framework 2009, the Northern Growth Area Structure Plan 2014 and more recently the Porirua Growth Strategy 2048. Agrees with this assessment and the Proposed Plan Variation, to enable potential yield of over 500 homes on the Muri Road block.</p> <p>Economic and social benefit will be significant creating employment for hundreds of people during the construction and development phases, in civil works, residential construction,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>goods and services, consultancy, and associated businesses.</p> <p>Supports the purpose behind the Proposed Plan Change in developing residential living, supported by a Structure Plan and underpinned by significant technical information.</p> <p>Critically this will address key objectives, policies and rules in relation to freshwater management, erosion and sediment control and land management principles, in recognising the special ecological features of the land.</p> <p>Acutely aware of the need for environmental sustainability with such a project and the removal of pine trees to build this development will enable plenty of bird life, for example, to return through the ecological corridors that will be enhanced within the site. Protection and enhancement of the defined ecological features on the site will be of utmost priority; essential in realising our Vision for the development.</p> <p>Excited to be a part of the Northern Growth Area Development in delivering a quality product that will provide for outstanding residential living in amongst a stunning natural environment. Bringing this Vision to fruition will leave an enduring legacy for the wider Porirua region for many generations to come.</p>
FS17.604	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS22.3	On Behalf of landowner SS Pointon	Support	Allow the whole submission	Support the submission by Pukerua Holdings Ltd (submitter 27) for the creation of the NGA.

				The support of the submitter is that it would be successful enable our submission to extend to extend the NGA area to include our land achievable.
OS68.6	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	If and when any development proceeds in the Northern Growth Area, we consider that both the intent and detail of these provisions must be closely adhered to, monitored and enforced.
FS17.287	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.484	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.1- General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.6	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	PCC should prioritise modelling if natural hazards across the whole site and the identification of adaptation required to changing risks from climate change impacts before development of the site.	Most of the site has not been modelled for natural hazards. Given the increased risk from climate change impacts, this needs to be done before resource consents are issued for development on the site.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.105	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS47.16	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	Reconsider the Boffa Miskell suggestion to move the commercial centre away from the QE2 protected area near the entrance from SH59. This would depend on suitable flat land, and whether it could still be close to the community park, which would be essential.	This is to protect the QE2 area and prevent environmental degradation of the bush.
FS17.115	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS47.17	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	2. Ensure the connection to SH59 includes a safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists over the state highway to allow non-car access to train stations to the south. Investigate the feasibility of building another train station around Airlie Rd to provide more convenient access to public transport to reduce the increase in traffic heading south on the state highway.	Connectivity extends beyond the immediate Structure Plan area and into the connections with State Highway 59. Access to public transport needs to make it easy for people to not use their private cars for travel. Access needs to be available as soon as possible to new residents as the development to proceed to ensure its used becomes ingrained habits.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.116	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS47.18	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	The concerns of safety and convenience to residents along most of the length of Muri Road, and many other recreational users of the road must be noted and be part of PCC's consideration of resource consent applications for Stage 1 and subsequent stages of the development.	Connectivity extends beyond the immediate Structure Plan area and into the connections with State Highway 59. Access to public transport needs to make it easy for people to not use their private cars for travel. Access needs to be available as soon as possible to new residents as the development to proceed to ensure its used becomes ingrained habits.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]

FS17.117	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS47.19	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	PCC needs to work with other agencies and the developers to adequately support the stages of development to mitigate the impacts of development, particularly on access to public transport and movement into, around and out of the new communities, and to allow progressive access to these forms of movement as the new community is developed.	Connectivity extends beyond the immediate Structure Plan area and into the connections with State Highway 59. Access to public transport needs to make it easy for people to not use their private cars for travel. Access needs to be available as soon as possible to new residents as the development to proceed to ensure its used becomes ingrained habits.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.118	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.1	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Not Stated	Predator Free status of the Northern Growth Development Area  Create a new guideline.	There is no provision in this plan for protecting our biodiversity.  Our biodiversity is vulnerable. Domestic and other introduced predators consume large numbers of birds, lizards and invertebrates. While most people think of native birds as our biodiversity, it should be noted that Pukerua Bay is known as a lizard hotspot with a significant number of lizard species. The community is aiming for predator free status as are a lot of communities through Aotearoa. Pukerua Bay is aiming for predator free status as are a lot of communities through Aotearoa. The DP is silent on protecting our biodiversity. The scale of this new Development Area is an opportunity to

				<p>create an urban environment free of domestic pets including and not limited to cats, ferrets, weasels, hedgehogs, mice, rats, stoats and rabbits.</p> <p>Dogs must be more controlled. ALWAYS on leads unless in a dog exercise area.</p>
FS17.126	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.2	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Not Stated	<p>Dog Control Traffic Control Pest Control.</p> <p>Create a new guideline.</p>	<p>There is no provision in this plan for protecting the ecological values of Pukerua Beach.</p> <p>The addition of many more houses in Pukerua Bay will put additional pressure on the beach and coast environment with many more people considering this their local beach. Currently the vulnerable population of kororā little penguins is at risk from off-lead dogs, cats and mustelids, as well as vehicles. Their protection must be ensured through robust signage and appropriate dog and pet by-laws. The likely increase of traffic on Pukerua Beach Road is an issue. This road which is in part one-way, has proven to be very vulnerable to slips in 2022, and it is unlikely to ever cope with increased traffic volumes. Currently on most summer weekends all official parking spaces are taken, leading to cars parking in appropriately and dangerously. This is not a case for additional parking but for consideration of improving protection of the coast's wild values and providing access</p>

				to the beach in other ways. Our biodiversity is a taonga and it is incumbent on us to take all measures to protect and encourage all the native species that live on and under the earth, in the air, in the sea and on the rocks and beaches around us.
FS17.127	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.3	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Not Stated	Few cars, less reliance on cars.  Create a new guideline.	There is no provision for designing the urban environment for a car less future.  Recently Central Government has removed parking requirements. We are heading towards a less car reliant future. We could facilitate car sharing and e-charging infrastructure, scooter charging stations et al be capable of being established as a permitted activity (without the need for resource consent). Aiming for community cohesion. These themes are around us. Let's seize the opportunity to include these ideas into our design guidelines. This is a golden opportunity to develop a greenfield site.
FS17.128	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.4	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Not Stated	We request that infrastructure upgrades are identified and prioritized.  Create a new guideline .	We are concerned about the absence of clarity around existing infrastructure capacity.  Not sure where to put this - we wish to talk to the fact that our services are currently

				under pressure and are not meeting the needs of the existing community. (E.g storm water, road to the beach). Will this be addressed before huge new infrastructure is provided for the new development?
FS17.129	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.5	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Not Stated	Every effort must be made to ensure invasive weeds aren't allowed to spread into the new development and a plan to encourage appropriate native plants on private property must be included.  Create a new guideline.	There is no provision for the management of weeds that inevitably follow land development.  Housing development and development of parks and recreation areas opens up fertile ground for invasive weeds. There is already a significant problem with weeds in Pukerua Bay including vines such as blue morning glory and banana passionfruit in Wairaka Reserve. Alongside SH59 there are significant patches of climbing asparagus and boneseed is rampant with no efforts being made to control this despite GWRC listing this as a weed that must be notified if it is growing on private property. Other significant weeds include pampas, pigs ear succulents and agapanthus.
FS17.130	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS59.2	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Oppose	Opposes specific parts of the DEV-NG-Northern Growth Area chapter as set out in the track changed version of the chapter at Appendix 1 to the submission.	If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in



			[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	<p>supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be “in accordance with” the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from “in accordance with” to “consistent with” to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS127.486	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and

				ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS59.3	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	Seeks amendments to DEV-NG-Northern Growth Area chapter of the PDP as shown in the tracked changed version of the chapter at Appendix 1 to the chapter.	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially competing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be "in accordance with" the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from "in accordance with" to "consistent with" to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>To better achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS127.487	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and

				ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS59.8	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Support	Generally supports providing specific objectives, policies, rules and standards in the Northern Growth Area.	If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially competing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be “in accordance with” the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from “in accordance with” to “consistent with” to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period

				<p>should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS127.492	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS74.59	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Ensure the Development Area 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, having regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 policies 55 and UD.3 as required. This includes ensuring that potential adverse effects of greenfield development are mitigated appropriately, occur within contaminant limits set by Greater Wellington as required by the NPS-FM, and can comply with conditions on relevant discharge consents held by Wellington Water</p>	<p>Submitter supports the existing strategic direction in the PDP on appropriate urban form for Porirua, and strongly support medium density residential zoning.</p> <p>Submitter seeks for the provisions of all new development areas to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.</p> <p>In regards to scope, policy direction that relates to district-wide matters and greenfield development could be included in an IPI under section 80E.</p>

FS17.384	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.355	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Support the Northern Growth Development Area with amendments:  Seek the Neighbourhood Centre is up-zoned to a Local Centre	Supports the introduction of Northern Growth Development Area provisions in the PDP with amendments.
FS17.1023	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.388	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.362	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.356	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Support the Northern Growth Development Area with amendments:  Apply Medium Density Residential Zone and Residential Intensification Precinct within a walkable catchment of the centre.	Supports the introduction of Northern Growth Development Area provisions in the PDP with amendments.
FS17.1024	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.389	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.363	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS79.8	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	Seeks that PCC be proactive with central government and, as relevant, Kāinga Ora, in seeking caveats on significant development that ensure provision for increased / improved infrastructure is planned alongside any such development.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.426	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.373	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS79.13	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Amend	Seeks that environmental protection for the Taupō Swamp and catchment (similar to that provided for Plimmerton Farm Zone under PC18) be applied to the Northern Growth Development Area.	Concerns for the capacity of existing infrastructure to support the scale of this development.  Since Variation 1 was notified Kāinga Ora has announced it is assessing this area as a potential Specified Development Project, and awaits the outcome of this process.
FS17.431	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.91	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all of part 13 of OS79	Support the request that environmental protection for the Tāupo Swamp and catchment be applied to the Northern Growth Development Area or Specified Development Project if it becomes that.  Protections for Taupo Swamp and its contributing catchment that apply to the Plimmerton Farm Zone should be extended

				to the Northern Growth Area to ensure that any increased water runoff generated by intensive development throughout the area is factored into infrastructure provision.
FS127.378	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS79.15	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	PCC to look broadly at the overall impacts of both in-fill and greenfields intensification on existing services and facilities, for example, transport planning in line with population growth, infrastructure renewal and development, access to local business areas, provision of schools and recreation areas, and protection for the environment.	Hope expressed that the overall objectives of the city's Growth Strategy are not lost in the push for intensification, and urge council to keep alive the big picture of Porirua as a liveable, vibrant city serving its residents and communities well into the future.
FS17.433	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.380	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS82.1	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Not Stated	Seeks adequate protections to be in place to ensure that increased housing supply and intensification in the district is undertaken within the ecological capacity of the area, and that the open space values and natural environment that make Porirua so special are safeguarded for future generations.	Submission relates specifically to the QEII covenants and properties within the immediate area, and the impacts that the proposed Northern Growth Development Area will have on the protected values at these sites.  The QEII covenants and properties within and nearby the Northern Growth Development Area:  QEII Open Space Covenants – there are several QEII covenants along the eastern



				<p>side of the proposed Northern Growth Development Area – within the zone boundaries and directly adjacent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-07-462–467 and 5-07-311 – these covenants are identified as part of SNA010 (Muri Road wetland) in the NGA structure plan and proposed District Plan. 5-07-311 is within the NGA, adjacent to areas that are proposed Medium Density Residential Zone. These covenants protect a raupō reedland gully system and provide habitat for several at-risk and regionally rare species.</li> <li>• 5-07-763 – this covenant is identified in the proposed District Plan as SNA029 and, while not within the NGA boundary, it is directly adjacent to the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Zone. This area is highly representative primary forest and one of the best examples of remaining old growth pukatea, kohekohe, and tawa forest in the district. Variation 1 introduces provisions for buffering of the impacts of development on SNAs within the NGA boundary. As this covenant/SNA is not within the development area but rather directly adjacent to it, the protective provisions would not</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>apply. Changes to several sections of the plan are suggested to ensure that the biodiversity values of this highly valued site are also protected from adverse impacts of development.</p> <p>Taupō Swamp – The submitter owns 29.7 ha of the Taupō Swamp Complex, just south of the proposed development area. The entire Taupō Swamp Complex (43 ha) is a nationally representative example of a topogenous lowland freshwater mire (peat-forming wetland). 19% of the NGA site drains to the Taupō Stream catchment via the Taupō Swamp sub-catchment.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including figure]</p>
FS17.1077	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.92	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS127.383	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.
OS90.1	Guy Marriage	Not Stated	Need a route over SH59 to the other side of the road and the provision of a new rail	Considers that the Northern Growth Area is lacking one crucial thing - along with the

		<p>station midway between Pukerua and Plimmerton.</p>	<p>Plimmerton Farm proposal - the need for a route over SH59 to the other side of the road and the provision of a new rail station midway between Pukerua and Plimmerton. The present gap between stations is excessive, but is justified at present as nobody lives between the two centres. With the addition of another 5-10,000 residents over the years, and the absolute need for these extra people not to have to drive to work, and not to have to drive across SH59 and park on the other side, it seems imperative for planning to made now for a future station, and for a future pedestrian / cycling link to be made for it now.</p> <p>Submitter envisages that a new train station would be somewhere near the present junction between the two schemes - ie near the existing farmhouses / Airlie Road junction - and hence also near the edge of the cemetery. This is presumably where a proposed new road access is made onto SH59 is made - but this should be planned now to have a generous pedestrian / cycle overbridge from east to west, separate from the road access below. That's the only way to ensure that future generations can easily catch the train - if we design in the infrastructure now, and that means designing to avoid pedestrians physically</p>
--	--	---	--

				<p>crossing the road (SH59) now and in the future.</p> <p>Submitter concerned about another 5000 cars pouring onto the highway at these points, because the two existing train stations are simply too far away to catch, and a proposed new station here would not work if people had to cross a busy highway.</p>
FS17.463	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.1	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>PCC literature in relation to the NGDA states that this variation is required to meet the council's obligations under the NPS-UD. The PCC 'Porirua Growth Strategy 2048' states that potentially 10,500 new homes will be required to accommodate projected population growth. This document identifies several residential zones and their potential dwellings: [Growth figures provided]</p> <p>The current plans and existing urban zones go a long way to satisfying the projected housing needs over the next 30 years. The reference to extending urban boundaries to the east to encompass the land from Lanes Flat to Kenepuru and east of Waitangirua and Cannons Creek to the newly opened State Highway 1. A substantial area which would yield a considerable number of dwellings.</p> <p>The 2048 strategy states the development of both Stebbings and Lincolnshire farms</p>

				<p>are under the WCC catchment but are close to Porirua geographically will yield 2600 more homes and will naturally soak up some of the PCC projected population growth.</p> <p>Questions where the housing demand is for the change in zoning. When questioned at the Pukerua Bay residents' association meeting on the 27th of April all council staff could respond with when questioned "why the sudden need/change" was that they now have a motivated developer. Objective 3(c) of the NPSUD refers to high demand for housing. Nowhere in the literature read does it state that a "motivated developer" is reason enough to push through zoning changes.</p>
FS17.479	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.2	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What investigations have been done to model intensification of existing urban areas and including zoning changes to allow medium density housing in those locations listed in [separate submission point]. The 2048 strategy promotes a compact liveable city. Establishing a new subdivision on the furthest and most remote northern boundary hardly sits in line with that statement;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What cooperation has been carried out with the WCC regarding its northern boundary to explore intensification in those areas adjacent to the PCC catchment area that are well served by rail and other modes of transport; and</li> <li>• Whether the PCC HBA delved into these possibilities.</li> </ul>
FS17.480	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.392	Alan Collett	Support	Support a complete review of flood hazard mapping and modeling to ensure the input data it is based on is true and correct. Support a complete review of flood hazard mapping and modeling to ensure the input data it is based on is true and correct.	<p>Support a review by Wellington Water of the flood modeling for Pukerua Bay and in fact other areas of Porirua City due to the discovery that as built drainage input data provided by PCC has been proven to be wrong in Gray Street, Pukerua Bay. This is supported by further investigations by myself, meetings on site with a Wellington Water representative and e mail correspondence from Wellington Water that the drainage data supplied by PCC does not match that which has actually been installed.</p> <p>Support a review by Wellington Water of the flood modeling for Pukerua Bay and in fact other areas of Porirua City due to the discovery that as built drainage input data provided by PCC has been proven to be wrong in Gray Street, Pukerua Bay. This is supported by further investigations</p>

				by myself, meetings on site with a Wellington Water representative and e mail correspondence from Wellington Water that the drainage data supplied by PCC does not match that which has actually been installed.
OS99.3	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Objective 2 of the NPSUD requires that planning decisions improve housing affordability. Questions how the proposed change intends to achieve that. The Northern Ward is the most expensive area within the PCC catchment. The PCC HBA outlines house price to cost ratios and states that house prices are mainly driven by land costs in Porirua. Disagrees, and states that in today's climate this ratio has severely shifted below 1:5 and that construction costs are now the dominating factor. Any land costs within New Zealand are usually inflated by the slow parcel release tactics of developers to main a high demand as evidenced in developments such as Churton Park. Questions how the proposed new houses achieve objective 2 of the NPSUD.
FS17.481	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.4	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Questions whether PCC has considered its ability, as provided by policy 4 of the NPSUD, to modify its requirements under policy 3 of the NPSUD in that density

				<p>requirements are only applied to the extent necessary to ensure accommodation of one or more of the following qualifying matters:</p> <p>a. Area being subject to a designation or heritage order given Pukerua Bay has significant Māori history.</p> <p>b. Matters necessary to implement, or ensure consistency with, iwi participation. Questions whether Ngati Toa been consulted and involved as per policy 9(c).</p> <p>c. This area is inappropriate for medium density housing given its remoteness within the PCC catchment, vulnerability to isolation and limited public transport.</p>
FS17.482	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.5	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Objective 3 (b) of the NPSUD requires the area to be well serviced by existing or planned public transport. Questions how PCC intends to meet these criteria. The current Pukerua Bay rail station is limited in its capacity, it is often out of service and bus replacements are required. There are no park and ride facilities nor is there any land area to provide one. The proposed urban area is not within walking distance of this station especially for those with young families or the elderly or in severe weather.
FS17.483	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.6	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Questions whether PCC is sufficiently satisfied there will be the necessary



				<p>infrastructure to support such an increase in housing within Pukerua Bay. If so, please provide evidence of this as your current structure plan lacks detail.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stormwater mitigations to be put in place;</li> <li>• Allowances for increases in sewerage capacity;</li> <li>• Preservation of waterways and catchments areas;</li> <li>• Preservation of indicated mixed indigenous ecological areas as per the map on page 3 of your information boards as identified by your own staff/contractors;</li> <li>• The proposals for the 'local centre', including business/employment opportunities will it provide, and whether it will meet the obligations of objective 3 (a) of the NPSUD.</li> </ul> <p>The lack of detail available to existing residents is unacceptable, and it is hard to submit on such a proposal with out it.</p>
FS17.484	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.7	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Objective 8 of the NPSUD speaks to supporting reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and the future effects of climate

				change. Questions whether the irony is not lost on PCC that a forest planted for carbon sequestration is to be uprooted to make way for this development.
FS17.485	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.8	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Suggests that PCC put resource consent requirements on the developer to mitigate the destruction of such a large forestry block such as entering into negotiations with the existing residents of Gray Street and Pukemere Way to discuss the feasibility of a 'green belt' which could include the preservation of identified significant ecological areas, preserve some forestry for the existing bird life that is flourishing in the area and go some way to minimise the 'detraction of amenity values existing residents appreciate' as referred to in policy 6(b)(i) of the NPSUD.
FS17.486	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.9	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	A new subdivision established at the city margins will only exacerbate urban sprawl and do little to ease the cost of housing. The true cost of housing in New Zealand lies in the construction costs, especially materials, and current legislation does nothing to address this. What is being proposed by the NPSUD is flawed and invasive on the New Zealand way of life, nor will it achieve the environmental balances it

				aspires to as developers will only have profit at the forefront of their minds.
FS17.487	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.10	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Expresses concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes from the Pukerua Bay residents' association meeting in February a PCC staff member is quoted as saying "several blocks to the south and east of Pukerua Bay are in the process of consent for residential development";</li> <li>• During the residents' association meeting on the 27th of April PCC staff openly said that the speed of which things were moving was due to the council having a "motivated developer";</li> <li>• Further questioning about the proposed area for development and its current carbon sequestration use revealed there had been a recent change of ownership to Barber Commercial Ltd;</li> <li>• Email correspondence with PCC staff has revealed that the PCC HBA is now being revised and will support this proposed variation; and</li> <li>• During the residents' association meeting on the 27th of April a PCC contractor revealed that there was</li> </ul>

				<p>an existing memorandum of understanding between Barber Commercial Ltd and the PCC.</p> <p>States that it appears that the proposed variation is a 'fait accompli' and that no submissions from the existing residents will matter.</p>
FS17.488	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS99.11	Alan Collett	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Questions whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mayor Baker will make her past commercial/professional relationship with the owner of Barber Commercial known;</li> <li>• Mayor Baker has a commercial interest in this development;</li> <li>• The encouragement of urban sprawl just an initiative to increase the rates take for the PCC;</li> <li>• The MOU between the PCC and the developer will be made public and what it binds the PCC to.</li> </ul>
FS17.489	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS108.1	Yvonne Fletcher	Amend	That recent extreme rain events causing SH59 closure (and any other issues) are considered against present knowledge of NGA hydrology.	Have any hydrological factors changed which may affect density planning? Is proposed NGA still suitable for extent of development or do housing densities need reassessment?

OS108.2	Yvonne Fletcher	Amend	That run-off and potential silting from NGA are strictly managed to avoid damage and risks to existing communities and environments at Plimmerton/Hongoeka, Pukerua Bay and Pāuatahanui Inlet.	Don't need to replicate or exacerbate any damage already done, e.g. Whitby - Pāuatahanui Inlet.
OS114.51	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Amend	<p>With this in mind [refer to reason for submission], Te Rūnanga notes that the NGA is at a scale and at a place (most land is on more than 12% gradient land and rarely a flat site) proposed, where this will also be a case. This prospect makes Te Rūnanga comprehend the impacts on Taiao. They are conscious of the consequences a bit more instead of what is doable, and it makes Te Rūnanga think what the scale of impact on several components of Taiao would be, as there is no way of measuring these impacts in an accurate way at the moment.</p> <p>Suggests these concerns should be looked at a larger scale not at the project level.</p>	Structure Plan may not be able to reflect the final outcome: As usually the case with Structure Plans, the complexities of construction, building, and carving such immense amount of earth, in a place where deep gullies and streams are, never ends up the way it is intended. Unexpected project outcomes, with its very nature, will be found out on the day as the engineering weighs in its way through. This warrants that Structure Plans are just indications of what roughly something might look like. However, the reality of building, manipulating earth, putting infrastructure, and coordinating the complexities of infrastructure does not realistically match the theoretical Plan.
FS17.579	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.442	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.52	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Amend	Assess landscape values as they also connect to Cultural Landscape Values. Were these values properly mapped? Have they been excluded from the Structure Plan as ringfencing the greenfield development land? It is hard to imagine the visual	Landscape Values: Whilst the two proposed sites may not be a Special Amenity Landscapes and Outstanding landscapes; they form important and significant hilltops and ridgelines which has outstanding views to North and South. But more importantly,

			impacts of these proposals will be less than minor and can be addressed in the appropriate way.	they are large parts of integrated Cultural Landscapes from Te Ara Taua and Pukerua Bay and Taupō Pā.
FS17.580	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.175	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek identification of cultural and spiritual landscape values and provisions to manage any adverse effects on those values.	Greater Wellington acknowledge the strategic objectives provide for the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira, however these do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. Greater Wellington consider a landscape assessment which considers the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira is required, and provisions included to manage adverse effects on those values.
FS127.443	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.53	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Amend	Whilst the expert advice mentions, the structure plan have considered these impacts and these concerns have informed the design of the Structure Plan; Structure Plan can only convey the theoretical aspects of these concerns. In reality, because of the unknowns and the scale of the works and their complexity, in the absence of detailed risk analysis, Te Rūnanga cannot be sure how these can be balanced against the construction and the works.	Tipping points for ecological systems: At this stage, it is unclear to be sure about the proposal will achieve ecological outcomes. Seeing the current expert assessments, it is overwhelming to see the ecological assessment and the resources at stake and difficulty of achieving these outcomes, are not clear. This issue will further be worsened if the infrastructure matters are not organised and operationalised specifically around the three waters space which Te Rūnanga will refer to below [refer

			<p>Te Rūnanga would like further research and work to be done.</p> <p>[Refer to reason for submission - in relation to tipping points for ecological systems]</p>	<p>to submission point on stormwater management] .</p> <p>Getting back to the potential effects; the list provided by the expert ecologist is overwhelming, these include but not limited vegetation clearance, increased run off, loss of wetlands, sedimentation of stream substrates, loss of stream habitat and changes to hydrology, increased risk of contamination.</p>
FS17.581	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.444	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.54	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Amend	A detailed stormwater management plan is required to explain how tangibly stormwater will be managed.	<p>Stormwater management is not defined: Stormwater poses major risks in the absence of sufficient infrastructure.</p> <p>Te Rūnanga have done some deliberations regarding the stormwater management of the site which at the time of drafting this submission, a detailed 'Stormwater Management Plan' was not available.</p> <p>Given that there needs to be plenty of available land (land bank) to increase detention and treatment capacity, and currently this is proposed to be done through using the detention capacity of gullies, it is concerning this issue will need</p>

				more apprehension for flooding and stormwater inundation purposes and runoff pollution. NGA is said to deliver the stormwater quality objectives laid out in the Structure Plan and stormwater management plan and achieve hydraulic neutrality or improve existing downstream inundation levels. This will be critical to the project.
FS17.582	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.102	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow	A detailed stormwater management plan is an essential component of providing assurance that stormwater can be managed in the Northern Growth Developmental Area. Support the request for amendment.  Stormwater heading downstream and into the harbour is a prime risk in the proposed development. It is prudent that a plan on how environmental damage can be prevented is provided early and upfront.
FS127.445	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.55	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Amend	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Regulatory Setting: The proposed changes to the Regional Policy Statement will be stricter in that just providing water sensitive urban design won't itself be indicative of adequate stormwater management; given that WSUD is limited in high gradient and low permeable land, this leaves a more



				<p>stringent approach regarding Te Rūnanga whaitua recommendations and its implementation in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP).</p> <p>Te Rūnanga consider objectives, policies, and rules that will come out of PNRP process to be more stringent on the stormwater management and water quality measures. Regarding further regulatory context, such as the PCC Notified Plan, in the absence of a detailed environmental and stormwater management plan, it is challenging to understand how NE-O3 and NE-O4 and THWT-O1 will be achieved.</p>
FS17.583	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.446	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
FS127.503	Rebecca Davis	Support	Allow	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
FS127.504	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter supports whole point.	It is vital to protect the flourishing bird life in the Muri Rd forestry block which will be destroyed through development.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.5	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	<p>Add a new section to introductory principles as follows:</p> <p>Climate change and resilience The development will incorporate design principles that anticipate the effects of climate change, both to mitigate its impacts and to avoid contributing to it. Landform, infrastructure, urban design, water runoff, and placement of structures will anticipate an increase in extreme weather events and be designed to minimise the impacts of these events and other natural hazards, and to increase community resilience. Transport design and connectivity will seek to minimise the reliance on private motor vehicles for personal transport and maximise use of and access to public transport and carbon-neutral, active transport modes, such as cycling. Interpretation of rules around development must be in line with the Council's Climate Change Strategy.</p>	<p>The District Plan does not acknowledge the increasing natural hazard risks from climate change and the need for changes in lifestyle and how we move around. This new introductory principle explicitly identifies that and makes it a requirement for planning to take account of that.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.104	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.93	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek a new principle for climate change and resilience is included in	Greater Wellington agree that the development in the Northern Growth

			the introduction to the Northern Growth Development Area Chapter.	Development Area will need to consider the impacts of climate change. Recognising this in the Northern Growth Development Area Chapter has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.
--	--	--	---	---

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.3-Urban form

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.1	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>In relation to Introductory principles; Urban form, add the following wording to the principle:</p> <p>Urban form The way the Development Area is subdivided will introduce long-term development patterns and will therefore determine the quality and character of the area. Ensuring that subdivision is well-designed is therefore integral to achieving a well-functioning and high quality living environment for future residents. <u>There will be a range of dwelling styles and sizes to ensure availability and affordability for a wide variety of household sizes and stages of life to account for the projected increase in the older population.</u> Inclusion of the structure plan within the District Plan will assist in achieving a well-functioning urban environment, and the Development Area provisions will ensure that the Structure Plan is implemented. Underlying zoning</p>	<p>Housing in Pukerua Bay lacks variety, availability and affordability, and these new development should provide a range of dwelling options for all stages of life. Current design of Pukerua Bay means access for people with limited mobility is restricted. These new developments must be more accessible for more people. Detailed reasons and discussion are included in the attached submission</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

			provisions and district-wide provisions will also help ensure that subdivision, use and development, including any associated earthworks, are appropriate. <u>Universal accessible design principles are incorporated into the subdivision to make the whole community, including recreational spaces and facilities, accessible to people with disabilities and of different ages, from the very young to the very old.</u>	
FS17.100	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS47.2	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	PCC should continue to support the development of a design guide that support and encourages universal accessible design principles for homes and recreational areas.	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.101	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.6- Recreation areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.3	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	Add the following wording:  The Structure Plan identifies a network of neighbourhood parks that enable residents to easily access a park or reserve close to	Pukerua Bay has no sports fields and the Plimmerton / Mana area does not have enough to support a growing population. There needs to be more variety in the types of open spaces to include smaller, more

			<p>their home. The Structure Plan also identifies a neighbourhood community park, <u>including the potential for sports field(s)</u> next to the neighbourhood centre, which will provide a large recreational space with good accessibility from road and active transport networks that service both the Development Area and the wider Pukerua Bay urban area. Additionally, four indicative neighbourhood reserve areas are identified to provide amenity and day-to-day recreational opportunities for residents. <u>There will also be provision for street-level open spaces as informal gathering places for neighbours.</u></p>	<p>passive spaces where neighbours can gather for informal interaction to help built community bonds and provide spaces for small children to play close to their houses.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.102	Leigh Subritzky	Support	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.</p>

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.7- Freshwater Management Areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS59.4	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p><u>FMA's can accommodate uses compatible with urban activities including infrastructure, earthworks and amenity features.</u></p>	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not</p>

				foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be "in accordance with" the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from "in accordance with" to "consistent with" to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years). [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS127.488	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.8-Connectivity

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.4	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	Ensure that people living in houses across the whole development are within a safe	Connectivity extends beyond the immediate Structure Plan area and into the

			and reasonable walking distance of public transport, whether that be buses (which would require one or more new bus routes being created) or train stations.	connections with State Highway 59. Access to public transport needs to make it easy for people to not use their private cars for travel. Access needs to be available as soon as possible to new residents as the development to proceed to ensure its used becomes ingrained habits.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.103	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.448	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	This needs to be planned for correctly.
OS81.30	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports the inclusion of indicative bus routes within the Structure Plan as this provides for alternative transport modes and enables future bus services.
FS17.1064	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.9- Objectives > 21.9.1-DEV-NG-O1 Purpose of the Northern Growth Development Area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS82.2	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	The Northern Growth Development Area contributes to achieving feasible development capacity to meet Porirua City's medium to long-term housing needs,	The importance of developing only within the area's ecological capacity needs to be

			<u>while balancing the environmental, cultural, and recreational values in the area.</u>	front and centre and included within the high-level objectives of this section.
FS17.1078	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.93	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS127.384	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.9-Objectives > 21.9.2-DEV-NG-O2 Planned urban built environment of the Northern Growth Development Area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.24	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	This area encompasses a sensitive environment where any development risks causing adverse and irreversible effects on two large and sensitive ecosystems: The Taupo Swamp and its contributing catchments and the Pauatahanui Inlet via the higher land that drains east, principally into the Kakaho catchment. Any development in this area must be carefully



				<p>managed to avoid risking adverse effects from sediment, contaminants and nutrients from entering these water bodies and eventually Te Awarua-o-Porirua. In particular, earthworks and related construction cause high levels of risk and must be closely managed and monitored.</p> <p>Strongly support the provision in DEV-NG-O2-8.</p>
FS17.78	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.475	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS47.7	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>Add as point 7:</p> <p>7. Community facilities designed for multiple uses by the whole community, and which are designed to create and build social cohesion;</p>	<p>This is to ensure community facilities, such as halls and open spaces, are flexible enough to be used for a variety of uses and by many types and sizes of groups.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.106	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.449	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Essential for communities to have places where they can come together.
OS47.8	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>Amend 9:</p> <p>Development that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of <u>on-site freshwater management areas and receiving waterbodies</u> including Te Awarua-</p>	<p>This is to reinforce the protection of on-site freshwater bodies as part of the planning of the urban form.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

			O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.	
FS17.107	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.6	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Amend	Qualify what a 'well-functioning urban environment consistent with...' means in relation to point 1.	What does well-functioning mean. How are proposed buildings to be measured or assessed as meeting the DP objectives? We've seen the Carrus Model (Aotea Block) of development made up of large houses on small pieces of land, with specimen trees, few useful plants and little relationship to their neighbours. Houses like these are readily available. Here in the Northern Growth Development Area we have a golden opportunity to create a different, sustainable, life enhancing approach. See also comments re point 8. We can ensure walking is safe through more pedestrian friendly focus with local parks and reserves made accessible as places to meet, picnic and enjoy the natural world. Also making community spaces available for co-operative gardening projects, or fruit tree growing or insect and bird observing. A Lizard Sanctuary could be on almost every street corner. The possibilities are endless
FS17.131	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.7	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Amend	Qualify what a 'quality living environment that is connected, accessible and safe' means in relation to point 3.	These descriptions are subjective. How are they to be measured or assessed as meeting the DP objectives? Safe could

				<p>mean every property is fenced and 'protected' from intrusion. Or safe could mean properties are built in a way that encourages community activity and connection through urban design. This could facilitate that there are parts of a house that are visible and 'speak; to their neighbours</p> <p>while other parts are private where privacy is provided by vegetation or position on the property. What is the intention of the term connected in this context? Transport connections? How is this to be assessed?</p>
FS17.132	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS55.8	Judith Frost-Evans and Gay Hay	Amend	Clarify what ecological values are to be maintained and protected in relation to point 8.	<p>The need for us to better serve the health and well being of receiving waterbodies is incumbent on us. How is the DP ensuring this will happen? It is woefully insufficient to threaten fines for harm done.</p> <p>Construction companies may be quite prepared to pay a fine after the event whereas when the first evidence of failure is recorded, then construction should be stopped. This is serious. We are talking about the life and well being of our environment. Harm done cannot always be undone, even with funds from fines. All construction must meet Hydraulic Neutrality.</p>
FS17.133	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS59.5	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p><u>Housing (including medium density housing)</u> with a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures;</p>	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be "in accordance with" the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from "in accordance with" to "consistent with" to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS127.489	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and

				ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS68.4	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>The Taupō Swamp and its contributing catchments lie at the heart of this area of proposed development. Concerned as to how such a sensitive environment might be at risk of any development causing adverse effects on its ecosystems and water quality. Careful management of any development must take account of the risk from sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering the catchment, the Taupō Stream and its wetlands, and eventually out to Porirua Harbour. Concerned over the management and monitoring of earthworks at every stage of any development in the catchment. Recent high rainfall events for instance, have left very visible scars on the hills east of Highway 59 – site of the Proposed Plimmerton Farm development.</p> <p>Strongly supports the statement in point 6, PHAACT/ GOPI submission: The provision in DEV NG O2, 8, that says: <i>“Development that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-OPorirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.”</i></p>
FS17.285	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS127.482	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS74.63	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend DEV-NG-O2(7) to also clarify that new subdivision, use and development must minimise reliance on private vehicles.	To have regard to Policy CC.2 in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.388	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.68	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain as notified.	Recognises the importance of impacts of use and urban development on waterbodies. Gives effect to Policy FW.3 of RPS Change 1
FS17.393	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS81.31	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	<p>Amend provision as follows:</p> <p>Subdivision, use and development in the Medium Density Residential Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone of the Northern Growth Development Area achieves:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. An urban form that is integrated with <del>the</del> <u>a safe and connected</u> transport network and <del>encourages</del> <u>includes</u> active transport modes; and</p> <p>...</p>	<p>Supports subdivision, use and development in the Northern Growth Development Area that achieves an urban form that is integrated with the transport network. Seeks that that this objective is amended to ensure subdivision, use and development is integrated with a safe and connected transport network. This is in line with the Porirua Growth Strategy.</p> <p>The term "encourage" within clause 7 should be replaced with the term "includes". The term "encourage" only requires active transport modes to be considered, whereas "includes" puts emphasis on active transport modes being required as part of subdivision, use and development.</p>

FS17.1065	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.177	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support amendments proposed to DEV-NG-O2.	Greater Wellington agree that the term "encourage" in DEV-NG-O2(7) should be replaced with the term "includes", as the term "includes" places greater emphasis on active transport modes being required as part of subdivision, use and development. Greater Wellington support the development of a multi-modal transport network.
OS82.3	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	<p>Subdivision, use and development in the Medium Density Residential Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone of the Northern Growth Development Area achieves:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A well-functioning urban environment consistent with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan;</li> <li>.....</li> <li>8. Development that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</li> <li>9. <u>Development that maintains and protects, and where possible,</u></li> </ol>	<p>Supports the objective, but would like to see the addition of a point to emphasise the importance of maintaining, protecting, and where possible enhancing terrestrial indigenous biodiversity to complement the existing point 8 (importance of protecting freshwater values) and emphasise the importance of a holistic approach to the impacts of the development on the natural environment.</p> <p>Notes that provisions relating to SNAs should be widened to cover all indigenous ecosystems and habitats with significant indigenous biodiversity values, not just those already identified and mapped in SCHED7 of the PDP to align with submitter's previous submissions on the proposed District Plan.</p>

			<u>enhances ecological values of Significant Natural Areas (including but not limited to those identified in SCHED7 – Significant Natural Areas).</u>	
FS17.1079	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.94	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS74.180	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments to DEV-NG-O2 to ensure subdivision, use and development maintains, protects and where possible enhances ecological values of significant natural areas.	Greater Wellington support the identification and controls on activities within and adjacent to significant natural areas, to give effect to Operative RPS Policies 23 and 24.
FS127.385	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.
OS92.1	Ministry of Education	Amend	DEV-NG-O2- Planned urban built environment of the Northern Growth Development Area  Subdivision, use and development in the Medium Density Residential Zone and Neighbourhood Centre Zone of the Northern Growth Development Area achieves:	[Refer to original submission for full reason]



			<p>3. A quality living environment that is connected, accessible, safe, reliable <del>and</del>, <u>and is connected to educational facilities.</u></p> <p>9. <u>An urban environment which is supported by educational facilities to meet the needs of the local community</u></p>	
FS127.450	Rebecca Davis	Support	Allow in whole.	Schools are not going to cope and this needs to be identified and dealt with otherwise schools like Pukerua Bay School will lose their field etc to terrible new classrooms.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.9-Objectives > 21.9.3-DEV-NG-O3 Provision of infrastructure

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.9	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Infrastructure with sufficient capacity is provided at the time of subdivision for urban use and is developed in an integrated, efficient and comprehensive manner to meet the planned needs of the Northern Growth Development Area, <u>and the anticipated impact of more extreme weather events resulting from climate change.</u></p>	<p>This is to explicitly link the requirement for infrastructure to planning for the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.108	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS74.94	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support amendments to DEV-NG-O3.	Greater Wellington support a risk-based approach and thus the amendments which anticipate the impact of more extreme weather events which result from climate change.
FS127.451	Rebecca Davis	Support	Allow in whole.	PCC has already pointed out that the current infrastructure cannot cope with the potential growth and what developers want to achieve and there is no funding allocation to upgrade the infrastructure therefore growth should not be occurring until this issue is resolved.
OS58.94	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports DEV-NG-O3 insofar as it requires infrastructure to be sufficiently provided at the time of subdivision for urban use with the Northern Growth Development Area.
FS17.227	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS81.32	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Supports this objective as it ensures infrastructure with sufficient capacity is provided at the time of subdivision.
FS17.1066	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.1-DEV-NG-P1 Use and development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS65.2	Gray Street Pukerua Bay Residents Group	Amend	Seeks the more detailed Ecological Connections on the Structure Plan Map, to	Reasoning outlined in more detail [in separate submission point] to ensure a

			<p>be used as the guidance for the Northern Growth Development Area.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>contiguous ecological corridor which will limit the effects of ecosystem fragmentation, protect the waterways and wetlands within the development area and in the adjacent PCC owned reserve land, and to mitigate the impact of habitat loss in a meaningful manner.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.277	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.24	Alan Collett	Support	Allow.	The submission is true and accurate. A green belt between the existing residents and any development would do wonders to retain the natural feel of the area, protect bird life, flora and fauna.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.2-DEV-NG-P2 Subdivision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.25	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports the provisions in DEV-NG-P2-6, 7, 8, and 9. When any development proceeds in the Northern Growth Area, we consider that both the intent and detail of these provisions must be closely adhered to, monitored and enforced.

FS17.79	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.476	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS47.10	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	Add the following text as clause 4(d): Allows for the staging of the development in a manner that supports progressive access to public transport and open space connectivity;	This is to ensure that these services are available to new residents as they move into the development, without having to wait until it is completed before the transport network, access to public transport and ease of movement is available.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.109	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.95	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek the amendment to DEV-NG-P2 as requested.	Greater Wellington support the requested amendment to DEV-NG-P4 as it ensures public transport options will be available as the development progresses. This change has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy 57.
OS47.11	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	Amend 10:  Provides parks, reserves, pathways and open space areas <u>through the full extent of the built areas</u> , including a <u>mixed-use</u> neighbourhood community park and neighbourhood parks, <u>street-level gathering places</u> , and gully and hilltop reserves where opportunities exist; and	First point is to ensure open spaces are within easy walking distance for all parts of the development. Second point allows for the possibility of sports playing fields. Third point allows for places where neighbours can gather close to their houses, preferably with seats and shade trees, as discussed in our submission.

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.110	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS59.6	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p>8. Demonstrates that use and development within the Freshwater Management Areas identified on the Structure Plan:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>c.</u> Recognises and provides opportunities to enhance freshwater ecology, public access to and along freshwater bodies, and resilience to flood risk;</p> <p><u>d. Provides for earthworks (where necessary and appropriate) for urban development including infrastructure and reserve networks.</u></p>	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be "in accordance with" the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from "in accordance with" to "consistent with" to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

FS127.490	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS65.3	Gray Street Pukerua Bay Residents Group	Amend	Seeks amendment to replace the wording: “with a sufficient width scale” to read “with a minimum width of 50 metres” Seeks amendment to replace the wording: “appropriate mitigation of any severance caused by roads” with “no severance caused by roads”	50 metre width has been specified elsewhere and should be included here. There is no need for severance by roads, particularly in the Ecological Connection.  Reasoning outlined in more detail [in separate submission point] to ensure a contiguous ecological corridor which will limit the effects of ecosystem fragmentation, protect the waterways and wetlands within the development area and in the adjacent PCC owned reserve land, and to mitigate the impact of habitat loss in a meaningful manner.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.278	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.25	Alan Collett	Support	Allow.	The submission is true and accurate. A green belt between the existing residents and any development would do wonders to retain the natural feel of the area, protect bird life, flora and fauna.
OS68.5	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports & reiterates the provisions in DEV NG P2.
FS17.286	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS127.483	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS74.69	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	In relation to DEV-NG-P2 Clause 7 - Retain as notified.	<p>The wording of DEV-NG-P2 (clause 7) is generally acceptable. Submitter supports a risk-based approach to manage subdivision use and development within the identified areas and minimising natural hazard risk to people's lives and properties is essential.</p> <p>Submitter supports this provision, as DEV-NG-P2 (clause 6) is aligned with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3.</p>
FS17.394	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.70	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Change wording of clause 8 to:</p> <p>Demonstrates that use and development <del>within</del> <u>impacts on</u> Freshwater Management Areas....</p> <p>Clarify in clause 9 that the term “hydraulic neutrality” is consistent with the definition of “hydrological controls” in Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>	<p>No.8 requires consideration of development within Freshwater Management Area, but all development will impact these areas, and the policy should be broader.</p> <p>This request is sought by GW to ensure DEV-NG-P2 (clause 8) gives effect to the NPSFM and has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3.</p> <p>The term hydraulic neutrality is limited to the control of peak flows. This is useful for mitigating flooding effects, but does not mitigate effects on ecosystem health. A broader set of flows and volumes is required to controlled.</p>

				This request is sought to ensure DEV-NG-P2 (clause 9) has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3 and the definition for hydrological controls.
FS17.395	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.52	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 70 of OS74	Support to further define the term "hydraulic neutrality"  Definition should be consistent with the definition of "hydrological controls" in proposed RPS Change 1 and go beyond control of peak flows.
OS74.88	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	In relation to DEV-NG-P2 Clause 6 - Retain as notified.	Submitter supports this provision, as DEV-NG-P2 (clause 6) is aligned with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3.
FS17.413	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS81.33	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	Amend provision as follows:  Provide for subdivision that is in accordance with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan, and where the design and layout of the subdivision:  ....  4. Provides a transport network layout and design that:	Supports this policy. Seeks that this policy is amended to ensure that subdivision provides a transport network layout and design that is safe. The policy as currently drafted does not provide for a safe layout/design which should be a requirement.  The policy does not adequately provide for a transport layout and design that incorporates all active modes and transport. There is specific reference to pedestrian connectivity and indicative bus routes. Clause 4 needs broadening to provide for all active modes and transport.



			<p>...</p> <p>c) Provides for <u>active modes</u> <del>pedestrian</del> and open space connectivity, including by incorporating legal public access along indicative track routes identified on the Structure Plan, and providing for opportunities to create recreational and open space linkages;</p> <p>d) <u>is safe for all transport users.</u></p> <p>e) Provides for active transport.</p>	
FS17.1067	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS82.4	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	<p>....</p> <p>5. Recognises and enhances ecological values of the Development Area, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Creating buffer areas around the edges of Significant Natural Areas <u>(including but not limited to those identified in SCHED7 – Significant Natural Areas)</u>; and</li> <li>b. Creating ecological corridors in the locations identified on the Structure Plan which will, over time, become dominated by indigenous vegetation, with a sufficient width, scale, and appropriate mitigation of</li> </ul>	Supports the policy with some minor amendments. “Minimising” adverse effects on waterbodies is a very low bar and that where possible, avoiding adverse effects should be considered and attempted first, in accordance with the effects management hierarchy.

			<p>any severance caused by roads, to connect and enhance Significant Natural Areas;</p> <p>6. <u>Following the effects management hierarchy with regard to addressing adverse effects on waterbodies, including by avoiding adverse effects on waterbodies where possible;</u> <del>Minimises adverse effects on waterbodies;</del></p>	
FS17.1080	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.95	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS74.159	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments that have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020.	Greater Wellington support the requested amendment to apply the effects management hierarchy as this would give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly Policy FW.3.
FS127.386	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.
OS92.2	Ministry of Education	Amend	DEV-NG-P2- Subdivision	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

			<p>4. Provides a transport network layout and design that:</p> <p>c. Provides for pedestrian and open space connectivity, <del>including</del> by incorporating legal public access along indicative track routes identified on the Structure Plan, <u>including to existing or planned educational facilities</u> and providing for opportunities to create recreational and open space linkages;</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10-Policies > 21.10.3-DEV-NG-P3 Potentially appropriate development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.20	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>Add the following text to the clause:</p> <p>3. It will compromise any cultural, spiritual and/or historical values, <u>sites of significance</u>, interests or associations of importance to Ngāti Toa Rangatira that are associated with the Northern Growth Development Area and if so, the outcomes of any consultation with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, in particular with respect to mitigation measures and/or the</p>	<p>This is to provide stronger protection and identification of discrete sites that may have culture, spiritual or historical values, which are currently not mentioned in this Policy.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

			incorporation of mātauranga Māori principles into the design and development of the activity;	
FS17.119	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.71	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain as notified.	The wording of this policy is generally acceptable in terms of managing the levels of risk to people, property and infrastructure from subdivision use and development. Supported by GWRC, as DEV-NG-P3 is aligned with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 51.
FS17.396	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS81.34	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	<p>Amend provision as follows:</p> <p>Only allow subdivision, use and development that is potentially not in accordance with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan where it is demonstrated that it is appropriate for such subdivision, use or development to occur within the Development Area, having regard to whether:</p> <p>1. The purpose and effects of the subdivision, use or development are likely to constrain, limit or compromise the intended development and use of the Development Area as set out in the Structure Plan, including consideration of:</p>	<p>Supports this policy. Seeks that this policy is amended to ensure that potentially appropriate development demonstrates that adverse effects will not compromise the safety and connectivity of the transport network. The policy as currently drafted only addresses the connectivity of the transport network. The policy requires amendment to ensure the safety of the transport network is not compromised.</p> <p>The policy does not adequately provide for active modes and transport. Subdivision, use and development needs to have specific regard to whether it will compromise or limit active modes or transport within the NGA. This will ensure that the inclusion of active modes and transport will be</p>

			...  f. <u>A safe and connected transport networks that provides for active modes and transport and that allows ease of movement to, from and within the Development Area; and</u>	adequately addressed
FS17.1068	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS82.5	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	[...]  d. Maintaining and enhancing ecological values within <u>and adjacent to</u> the Development Area;	Development within the NGA has the potential to adversely affect areas outside the NGA boundary that have high ecological values. P3 must refer to adjacent areas when considering affects on ecological values, to ensure that effects of "potentially appropriate development" that may leak over the NGA boundary are able to be considered by decision-makers.
FS17.1081	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.96	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS74.161	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments as requested by the submitter.	Greater Wellington support the requested amendments which provide protection for the significant natural area as these changes would have regard to Proposed

				RPS Change 1 and help to give effect to Operative RPS Policy 24.
FS127.387	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.
OS92.3	Ministry of Education	Amend	<p>DEV-NG-P3- Potentially appropriate development</p> <p>Only allow subdivision, use and development that is potentially not in accordance with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan where it is demonstrated that it is appropriate for such subdivision, use or development to occur within the Development Area, having regard to whether:</p> <p>1. The purpose and effects of the subdivision, use or development are likely to constrain, limit or compromise the intended development and use of the Development Area as set out in the Structure Plan, including consideration of:</p> <p>f. <u>Connected transport networks that allow ease of movement to, from and within the Development Area, including to existing and planned educational facilities.</u></p> <p>h. <u>There is a need to provide educational facilities which support the local community.</u></p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.10- Policies > 21.10.4-DEV-NG-P4 Inappropriate development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.12	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>3: <u>Compromise any cultural, spiritual and/or historical values, sites of significance, interests or associations of importance to Ngāti Toa Rangatira;</u></p> <p>4. Do not provide sufficient <u>extra</u> infrastructure to service its needs and/or constrain, limit or compromise the efficient provision of infrastructure to service the Structure Plan.</p>	<p>Submitter believes this needs to be considered as a criterion to identify inappropriate development that should not proceed, rather than just being something to consider when considering potentially appropriate development, in order to give the values more significance.</p> <p>Adding 'extra' will ensure that development does not proceed until the extra infrastructure that is needed, and its funding, are identified.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.111	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.96	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support amendments to DEV-NG-P4.	Greater Wellington support provisions to protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira and note that while the proposed District Plan provides strategic objectives, they do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori.
OS47.13	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Support	PCC does not issue resource consents for the developments allowed by the DP	This should be a policy decision by PCC to ensure inappropriate development does

			variation until funding for the extra infrastructure is identified.	not proceed without the necessary infrastructure.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.112	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.72	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend DEV-NG-P4 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid subdivision, use or development that is not in accordance with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan, where these:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Constrain, limit or compromise the intended development and use of the Development Area as set out in the Structure Plan;</li> <li>2. Result in adverse effects on the planned urban built environment of Development Area, which cannot be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated;</li> <li><u>3. Are located within areas of high Flood Hazard risk; or</u></li> <li><del>4</del> 3- Do not provide sufficient infrastructure to service its needs and/or constrain, limit or compromise the efficient provision of infrastructure to service the Structure Plan.</li> </ol>	To ensure DEV-NG-P4 has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies 29 and 51, by avoiding subdivision, use and development in areas of high Flood Hazard risk.



FS17.397	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.53	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 72 of OS74	It would be extremely foolhardy if the Variation led to use and development in areas of high flood hazard use. We support the submitter's request for avoidance of subdivision, use or development of such areas  Commonsense to avoid compounding flood risk issues by intensive development through building in high flood prone areas.
OS82.6	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	Avoid subdivision, use or development that is not in accordance with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan, where these: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Constrain, limit or compromise the intended development and use of the Development Area as set out in the Structure Plan;</li> <li>2. Result in adverse effects on the planned urban built environment of Development Area, which cannot be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated; or</li> <li>3. Do not provide sufficient infrastructure to service its needs and/or constrain, limit or compromise the efficient provision of infrastructure to service the Structure Plan; <u>or</u></li> <li>4. <u>Are unable to provide adequate protection to significant natural areas and waterbodies identified in the Structure Plan.</u></li> </ol>	Protection of SNAs and waterbodies in the NGA must be a priority given the rarity of these ecosystems and the intensity of surrounding development. Suggests the addition of point 4 to ensure that any subdivision, use, or development outside of the NGA structure plan may not occur where it is unable to provide adequate protection to the natural environment.
FS17.1082	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS32.97	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS74.160	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments to DEV-NG-P4 as requested by the submitter.	Greater Wellington support the requested addition to this policy as it would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and help to give effect to Operative RPS Policy 24.
FS127.388	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.
OS92.4	Ministry of Education	Amend	DEV-NG-P4  Avoid subdivision, use or development that is not in accordance with the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan, where these:  3. Do not provide sufficient infrastructure to service its needs, <u>including not providing for educational facilities</u> and/or constrain, limit or compromise the efficient provision of infrastructure, to service the Structure Plan.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS65.4	Gray Street Pukerua Bay Residents Group	Amend	Seeks amendment so that any development not in accordance with the standards of the	The community that lives in Gray Street is at the interface of development and are

			Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan, and/or does not comply with the relevant provisions in the District Plan, has the requirement for the community to be notified and given the opportunity to provide feedback. Seeks the section 95A exemption for notification and review removed.	heavily invested in the Structure Plan, particularly the ecological values of the development land. For transparency purposes it is important to have the opportunity to provide feedback if and when developers want to depart from Structure Plan standards and/or the District Plan.
FS17.279	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.26	Alan Collett	Support	Allow.	The submission is true and accurate. A green belt between the existing residents and any development would do wonders to retain the natural feel of the area, protect bird life, flora and fauna.

**21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.1-DEV-NG-R1 Activities (excluding subdivision) that are permitted activities in the underlying zone > 21.11.1.1-All zones**  
**1. Activity status: Permitted**

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS59.7	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	[...]  Where:  a. The activity is <del>in-accordance</del> <u>consistent</u> with DEV-NG-Figure 1: Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan.	If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also

				<p>acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be “in accordance with” the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from “in accordance with” to “consistent with” to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS127.491	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and

				ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
--	--	--	--	--

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.2-DEV-NG-R2 Earthworks that are permitted activities in the Earthworks chapter

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS59.9	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The activity is <del>in accordance</del>consistent with DEV-NG-Figure 1: Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan.</p>	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be “in accordance with” the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from “in accordance with” to “consistent with” to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance</p>

				<p>documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS127.493	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.3-DEV-NG-R3 Subdivision of land within the Northern Growth Development Area

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS47.14	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	<p>Add the following two new sections to this clause:</p> <p>iv. Ecological corridors and SNA buffer areas to incorporate open space linkages to provide contiguous public access around all their margins for recreation and maintenance;</p> <p>v. Buffer areas around wetlands are designed to prevent excessing runoff into the wetland;</p>	<p>This is to ensure public access is maintained around these public areas so they cannot be encroached on, and to increase the protection of these freshwater areas, particularly in the early stages of the development when there will be more exposed soil contributing to erosion and runoff.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.113	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS47.15	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Amend	In relation to DEV-NG-R3-1-c(i) and DEV-NG-R3-2-c(ii), clarify the wording '50m wide'.	Submitter has inferred that the 'length' of these ecological corridors is the distance between the arrowheads on the lines on the Structure Plan and the 'width' is perpendicular to that. But, that might not be what is intended.
FS17.114	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.



OS59.10	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Amend	<p>[...]</p> <p>1. Activity status: Controlled</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>d. The design and layout of the subdivision is <del>in accordance consistent</del> with DEV-NG-Figure 1: Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>d. The design and layout of the subdivision is <del>in accordance consistent</del> with DEV-NG-Figure 1: Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan.</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>4. Activity status: Discretionary</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>c. Compliance is not achieved with DEV-NG-R3-3.</p> <p><b>€ Notification: An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly</b></p>	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be “in accordance with” the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from “in accordance with” to “consistent with” to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason,</p>
---------	--------------------------------	-------	---	--

			notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.	including attachment]
FS127.494	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS82.7	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	<p>1 and 2....</p> <p>b. Any subdivision of an allotment containing <u>or adjacent to</u> a Significant Natural Area identified in SCHED7 - Significant Natural Areas, or must include:</p> <p>i. A scheme plan which identifies a buffer area of at least 5 m wide around that part of the perimeter of the Significant Natural Area that is located within <u>or adjacent to</u> the allotment;</p> <p>ii. A planting plan and monitoring and maintenance programme for the buffer area which meets the requirements set out in Parts B and C of APP17 - Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer Areas; and</p> <p>i. Details of how the buffer area will be legally protected in perpetuity in accordance with Part A of APP17 - Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer Areas;</p>	<p>Support this section and are pleased to see provisions to mitigate the impact of subdivision on ecological values.</p> <p>As drafted, these provisions do not apply to the highly significant QEII covenant (SNA029) that is located directly adjacent to the NGA boundary and area zoned for "Neighbourhood Centre Zone".</p> <p>Development next to this covenant/SNA with no requirements for buffer zones, mitigation activities etc, will undoubtedly have an adverse impact on the protected areas' ecological values. Suggests minor amendments to the subdivision rules so that the buffer provision applies to adjacent SNAs also. If this is not adopted, expects this adjacent covenant/SNA protected from the development of the "Neighbourhood Centre" Zone through other means</p>
FS17.1083	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS32.98	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all suggested amendments	Support the suggested amendments requested throughout the parts 1 to 8 of the QE2 National Trust submission. All the proposals in parts 1 to 8 make sense in helping raise the bar on ensuring ecological values are respected when development is undertaken.
FS74.162	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments as requested by the submitter.	Greater Wellington support the requested amendments which provide protection for the significant natural area as these changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and help to give effect to Operative RPS Policy 24.
FS127.389	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.

## 21-DEV - NG - Northern Growth Development Area > 21.11-Rules > 21.11.5-DEV-NG-Figure 1 Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS65.1	Gray Street Pukerua Bay Residents Group	Amend	Seeks the Structure Plan map clearly identify to correct scale the requirement of the 50 metre wide Ecological Connections and for these to be situated directly adjacent to the existing PCC reserve land to create a contiguous corridor, with no road severance allowable.	Supports the requirement for the 50 metre wide ecological connections.  Expects that the Structure Plan map has enough detail to be a meaningful foundation so that the intended ecological protection is actually put in place during any development and that the impacts on

			<p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>biodiversity and waterways caused by the Northern Growth Area Development to be mitigated and for the Ecological Connections to provide a true green belt of large trees. Ensuring that placement of the Ecological Connections is adjacent to existing PCC reserve land is the best solution because this will ensure a contiguous ecological corridor and limit the effects of ecosystem fragmentation, protect the waterways and wetlands within the development area and in the adjacent PCC owned reserve land, and help to mitigate the impact of habitat loss as the pine trees are removed from the land in the wider development area. The PCC reserve land has been cared for by the Gray Street community with removal of pest plants and we are working to regenerate the native bush and increase biodiversity in this area. This is ongoing and done with the support of PCC. It also has a wetland in the Taupo Swamp Catchment and connects with the two SNAs as shown on the map. Development of this particular area of land and earthworks would pose a high risk to these environmentally important areas. The pine trees, while not native, are currently the home and nesting area for many native birds that include morepork, tui, piwakawaka, bellbird, kereru, grey warbler, silver eye and also a variety of finches. Falcons/hawks are seen hunting in the area. Kingfishers are seen in the wetland areas.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Lizards and frogs have also been found in the area.</p> <p>This year the Minister of Conservation, Hon Kiritapu Allan, launched the implementation plan for Te Mana o te Taiao in Porirua. This is a requirement for New Zealand to meet obligations under the United Nations Convention of Biological Biodiversity and there is a strong emphasis for local government to establish and steward systems and processes for biodiversity protection and restoration work. Along with the planting work outlined above, our community is active at trapping to make Pukerua Bay pest-free, and to enable and encourage the native birds, lizards and invertebrates to return. For us to now be faced with such large habitat destruction literally on our doorsteps is contrary to all we have been working to achieve.</p> <p>This is why the commitment from PCC is sought to amend and ensure the Structure Plan Map very clearly specifies the required placement and 50 metre width size of Ecological Connection and to ensure it will be large trees suitable for bird habitat.</p> <p>The concept of a green belt has been well supported by the wider Pukerua Bay community and the desire for this is documented over a number of years in The Pukerua Bay Village Plan.</p>
FS17.276	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS32.29	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow part 1 of OS65 of clear scale representation of 50m wide ecological connections.	Support the request for clear scale representation of the requirement of 50m wide ecological connections stated in point 1 of this submission.  Clarity of requirements right from the outset will help engender support and confidence in planning and delivery.
FS99.23	Alan Collett	Support	Allow.	The submission is true and accurate. A green belt between the existing residents and any development would do wonders to retain the natural feel of the area, protect bird life, flora and fauna.
OS65.6	Gray Street Pukerua Bay Residents Group	Amend	Seeks the boxed area to be drawn onto DEV-NG-Figure 1 Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan, replacing the blue arrows council has on map currently.	The arrows [on the Structure Plan] do not provide enough clarity or certainty that during subdivision / development that the ecological connections will be put into the place that provides maximum environmental benefits.
FS17.281	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.28	Alan Collett	Support	Allow.	The submission is true and accurate. A green belt between the existing residents and any development would do wonders to retain the natural feel of the area, protect bird life, flora and fauna.

## 22-HOSZ - Hospital Zone > 22.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS94.1	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Capital, Coast and Hutt Valley	Support	Submitter is a is supportive of the proposed objectives, policies, and rules, including where thresholds are set for planning involvement.	<p>Submitter states that it has been their pleasure to work closely with officers from PCC as part of Variation 1 to the PDP. The collaborative approach to the amendments to the proposed plan has enabled a framework which supports the expected investment and expansion of Kenepuru Community Hospital to deliver health services to our growing region.</p> <p>The urban context around the Hospital is changing, and the Submitter is pleased to see that the Hospital Zone settings have been updated to reflect this. The proposed settings will better enable Te Whatu Ora to deliver health services for the community and region.</p> <p>The PDP does a good job of establishing the enabling approach needed to allow for the Hospital to respond to changing health needs.</p>
FS17.1111	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 22-HOSZ - Hospital Zone > 22.3-Objectives > 22.3.3-HOSZ-O3 Adverse effects of activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
----------	-----------	----------	--------------------	---------

OS32.22	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend HOSZ O3 to read:  <b><i>Adverse Effects of Activities</i></b> <i>The adverse effects of activities taking place in the Hospital Zone are avoided, remedied or mitigated, particularly at zone boundaries and all activities sustain a <u>healthy and safe natural environment that maintains and protects and, where possible, enhances ecological values and the health and wellbeing of receiving waterbodies including Te Awarua-O-Porirua Harbour and other downstream catchments.</u></i>	To have requirements in the Plan that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.
FS17.76	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.473	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 22-HOSZ - Hospital Zone > 22.4-Policies > 22.4.5-HOSZ-P5 Inappropriate activities

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.23	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Amend	Amend HOSZ P5 to read:  <b><i>Inappropriate Activities</i></b> <i>Avoid use and development that is incompatible with the role and function of the Hospital Zone and which risks causing <u>adverse effects on natural resources including:</u></i>	To have requirements in the Plan that minimise the run-off of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into water bodies and which eventually risks entering Te Awarua-o-Porirua.



			<p><u>1. The adverse effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</u></p> <p><u>2. The adverse effects caused by excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</u></p> <p><u>3. The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</u></p>	
FS17.77	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.474	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 23-APP3 - Residential Design Guide > 23.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS118.124	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Seeks to exclude retirement villages from the applicability of the Residential Design Guide.	The Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs).
FS67.126	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 29-APP17 - Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer Areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS65.5	Gray Street Pukerua Bay Residents Group	Amend	Seeks that the type of planting required in the Ecological Connections to be specified as large trees suitable as habitat for native birds.	<p>Supports the requirement for the 50 metre wide ecological connections.</p> <p>Expects that the Structure Plan map has enough detail to be a meaningful foundation so that the intended ecological protection is actually put in place during any development and that the impacts on biodiversity and waterways caused by the Northern Growth Area Development to be mitigated and for the Ecological Connections to provide a true green belt of large trees. Ensuring that placement of the Ecological Connections is adjacent to existing PCC reserve land is the best solution because this will ensure a contiguous ecological corridor and limit the effects of ecosystem fragmentation, protect the waterways and wetlands within the development area and in the adjacent PCC owned reserve land, and help to mitigate the impact of habitat loss as the pine trees are removed from the land in the wider development area. The PCC reserve land has been cared for by the Gray Street community with removal of pest plants and we are working to regenerate the native bush and increase biodiversity in this area. This is ongoing and done with the support of PCC. It also has a wetland in the Taupo</p>

				<p>Swamp Catchment and connects with the two SNAs as shown on the map.</p> <p>Development of this particular area of land and earthworks would pose a high risk to these environmentally important areas. The pine trees, while not native, are currently the home and nesting area for many native birds that include morepork, tui, piwakawaka, bellbird, kereru, grey warbler, silver eye and also a variety of finches. Falcons/hawks are seen hunting in the area. Kingfishers are seen in the wetland areas. Lizards and frogs have also been found in the area.</p> <p>This year the Minister of Conservation, Hon Kiritapu Allan, launched the implementation plan for Te Mana o te Taiao in Porirua. This is a requirement for New Zealand to meet obligations under the United Nations Convention of Biological Biodiversity and there is a strong emphasis for local government to establish and steward systems and processes for biodiversity protection and restoration work. Along with the planting work outlined above, our community is active at trapping to make Pukerua Bay pest-free, and to enable and encourage the native birds, lizards and invertebrates to return. For us to now be faced with such large habitat destruction literally on our doorsteps is contrary to all we have been working to achieve.</p> <p>This is why the commitment from PCC is sought to amend and ensure the Structure</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				Plan Map very clearly specifies the required placement and 50 metre width size of Ecological Connection and to ensure it will be large trees suitable for bird habitat. The concept of a green belt has been well supported by the wider Pukerua Bay community and the desire for this is documented over a number of years in The Pukerua Bay Village Plan.
FS17.280	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.27	Alan Collett	Support	Allow.	The submission is true and accurate. A green belt between the existing residents and any development would do wonders to retain the natural feel of the area, protect bird life, flora and fauna.

## 29-APP17 - Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer Areas > 29.1- General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.77	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain Appendix 17.	Submitter supports the inclusion of new Appendix 17, which enables the protection of Ecological Corridors and SNA Buffer areas.
FS17.402	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS82.9	QEII National Trust (QEII)	Amend	B. Planting Plans A planting plan for any revegetation	Strongly supports these provisions. It is critical that eco-sourcing is required for all

			<p>planting must identify the following:  ...  u. Site planting, including species to be planted, sourcing of the plants (<u>eco-sourcing is required</u>), size and spacing of plants....</p>	<p>revegetation planting being undertaken in SNA buffer areas and ecological corridors. Eco-sourced plants create more representative eco-systems, are more likely to survive as they're adapted to local climatic conditions and ensure that genetic diversity is maintained in indigenous plant species across the country. In contrast, non-eco-sourced plants create a risk to the established values in the areas they are being planted to buffer. Hybridisation and out-competing local natives is a significant risk if non-eco-sourced plants are used, and this can be much harder to manage than pest plants from overseas.</p>
FS17.1085	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS127.391	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that point be allowed.	Adequate protections to ensure special areas, environmental and ecological areas are safeguarded for future generations.

## 30-SCHED7 - Significant Natural Areas > 30.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.78	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain amendments to Schedule 7.	Submitter supports the identification and inclusion of the new SNAs in the NGA, which give effect to Operative RPS Policies 23 and 24.
FS17.403	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS4.5	Philippa Sargent	Amend	Amend the wording for the map legend for the Hazards and Risks Overlays, specifically that for the 'Coastal Hazard – Current Inundation'.	<p>For the average person, the wording makes it seem like these areas currently have coastal inundation on a regular basis. Has lived at 1 Sunset Parade since 2008 and knows that this is definitely not the case. Seawater has never even breached the seawall at this point, let alone crossing the street into properties.</p> <p>Having talked to a PCC staff member, understands that this overlay is in fact just referring to events which are classified as 1 in 100 year storm surge events. This is not currently clear at all. It disadvantages rate-payers who have this showing for their property, as the average person/potential buyer/insurance company could interpret</p>

				<p>this to mean regular weather/storms do affect these properties, i.e. not just when it is a one in 100 year event.</p> <p>Some simple changes to the wording would clarify this.</p>
FS17.15	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS10.1	Leslie Callear	Oppose	Delete	A property of up to 6 floors could be built next to submitter which would restrict view and sun access. This would be without submitter's permission and could reduce property value. Street car parking would increase as there would be fewer garages or on section parking. The community village feel would be lost with the area turning into an inner city apartment dwelling area.
FS17.23	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS11.1	Paul Clegg	Support	Retain the decision not to have a HRZ in Pukerua Bay.	There are not the amenities or resources to support high density housing in Pukerua Bay.
FS17.24	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS99.18	Alan Collett	Support	Support green belts around existing residential areas and these green belts should encompass areas already identified by PCC as natural areas of significance.	Support all of these submissions in relation to protection, enhancement and maintaining natural areas, waterways and areas of ecological significance. Pukerua Bay and areas within the Northern Growth area are seeing the development of bird life

				and flora and fauna that would come under threat by these proposed changes.
FS127.1	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Muri Road not able to cope with traffic increase and safety of community. Ecological protection in the NGA is critical.
OS26.3	Kevin Clark	Not Stated	Seeks deletion of Variation 1.	<p>Submitter supports deleting this variation.</p> <p>Submitter considers the concept of six storied apartment blocks in this neighbourhood is strange. Generally all the sites are small residential sites suited to single unit dwellings. It will take many years before the houses in question are demolished, and sites amalgamated to allow for economically viable apartment blocks to be built (they will need lifts) , to the detriment of adjoining owners. There may be some sense in greenfields developments to the north of Plimmerton, but even that is questionable.</p> <p>Why the land between Steyne Avenue and the beach is zoned High Density is puzzling. There are restrictions on the land relating to rising sea levels and tsunami areas, and I understand that getting building consents for any new buildings in this area will be almost impossible. Questions why it is zoned for High Density.</p>
FS17.49	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS44.1	Ian McKeown	Amend	Do not amend the District Plan to incorporate any proposed higher density	Comments/concerns raised in relation to:



			<p>housing or medium density housing either on or adjacent to “identified flood prone” areas as this will only exacerbate and overload the current resources and place extra stress and harm on the current and future residents.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would the Council will respond to capacity issues with higher density and medium density housing</li> <li>• Current infrastructure cannot support current housing.</li> <li>• Flood prone areas and recent flooding events.</li> <li>• Discussions with PCC and with Wellington Water regarding flooding.</li> <li>• Acheron Road and parts of Mana Esplanade marked for higher density housing and medium density housing - how will this cope with severe weather storms, flooding and resultant damage.</li> <li>• Council responses to other issues (storm water drain cover matter and complaints about rubbish collection).</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>
FS17.98	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS56.3	John Cody	Support	<p>Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend the scope for high density development to within 1.2 km of a railway station unless precluded by</li> </ul>	<p>Supports the focus on public transport hubs, particularly railway stations.</p> <p>Public discussion based on experience in other places suggests that initial estimates</p>

			<p>engineering limitations or gradients.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific decisions about building heights should be subject to a requirement that changes in the pattern of settlement must contribute to the Objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>of a practical radius for active travel too low.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that the proposed rules prevent building activity that detracts from the objectives of the Variation.</p>
FS17.643	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.47	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Mapping changes are required to reflect amendments to the wider geographical spread of the HRZ to better achieve well-functioning urban environments and national and regional consistency.</p> <p>[see Appendix 3 to submission]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul>

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.715	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.31	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS74.140	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.35	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an

				absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.80	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.76	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request the part of the submission seeking to increase the residential height of Takapūwāhia and rezoning to High Density Residential Zone is disallowed.	We oppose increasing the residential height in Takapūwāhia. Enabling intensified development without appropriate controls puts pressure on our taiao and does not prioritise Te Mana o te Wai or climate resilience. This should be an area for Ngāti Toa to have tino rangatiratanga and decide how Ngāti Toa iwi would like development to occur on their whenua.
FS127.54	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.64	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Mapping changes sought are included in Appendix 3 [to submission]</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.732	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.32	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and

				the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS75.19	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.97	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS114.77	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	<p>We request the part of the submission seeking to increase the residential height of</p>	<p>We oppose increasing the residential height in Takapūwāhia. Enabling intensified development without appropriate controls</p>

			Takapūwāhia and rezoning to High Density Residential Zone is disallowed.	puts pressure on our taiao and does not prioritise Te Mana o te Wai or climate resilience. This should be an area for Ngāti Toa to have tino rangatiratanga and decide how Ngāti Toa iwi would like development to occur on their whenua.
FS127.71	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.121	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept all changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 [to submission].	<p>Opportunities for further high density housing should be explored to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres and Rapid Transit Stops in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Does not support the introduction of the qualifying matter applying to steep south facing sites and associated height restrictions. Seeks the removal of these areas from the mapped extent of the HRZ.</p> <p>Also seeks the rezoning of MUZ land to HRZ on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange to HRZ.</p>
FS17.789	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.35	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be

				included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.154	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.80	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request the part of the submission seeking to increase the residential height of Takapūwāhia and rezoning to High Density Residential Zone is disallowed.	We oppose increasing the residential height in Takapūwāhia. Enabling intensified development without appropriate controls puts pressure on our taiao and does not prioritise Te Mana o te Wai or climate resilience. This should be an area for Ngāti Toa to have tino rangatiratanga and decide how Ngāti Toa iwi would like development to occur on their whenua.
FS127.128	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been



				taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.165	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept the changes sought to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission.	Generally supports the MRZ mapping. In particular, supports the use and spatial application of the MRZ across the urban residential environment (except where changes are sought to upzone locations from MRZ to HRZ, as shown on the attached maps) [maps attached to submission]. Generally supports the use and spatial extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct within the MRZ but seeks some small increases in some locations to ensure the coverage includes sites in the MRZ that are within a 400m catchment of the Local Centre. Supports the proposed rezoning of land between 16 Mungavin Street and Champion Street to MRZ. Seeks an extension of the rezoning of land from Open Space to MRZ to also include land at 8-10 Champion Street, and the adjacent legal road.
FS17.833	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.37	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary

				submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.198	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.172	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.218	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Otherwise, retain and support the use of and spatial extent of the NCZ as notified.	Generally, supports the use of and spatial extent of the NCZ. However, seeks an extended footprint of the Neighbourhood Centre at Pukerua Bay. Also seeks consequential changes to the maps to include additional areas subject to Height Increase A, where the HRZ is extended

				through the submission around additional NCZ.
FS17.886	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.251	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.225	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.219	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept the changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission.	Generally, supports the use of and spatial extent of the NCZ. However, seeks an extended footprint of the Neighbourhood Centre at Pukerua Bay. Also seeks consequential changes to the maps to include additional areas subject to Height

				Increase A, where the HRZ is extended through the submission around additional NCZ.
FS17.887	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.39	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.252	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.226	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.243	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Retain Local Centre Zone and spatial extent as notified, with the exception of Mana, where a new Town Centre Zone is sought.	Generally supports the use of and spatial extent of the LCZ; although is seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area).
FS17.911	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.155	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.276	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the

				existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.250	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.245	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept the changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission.	Generally supports the use of and spatial extent of the LCZ; although Kāinga Ora is seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area).  Also seeking an increase in the height limit across the zone, to 22m, and seeks consequential changes to the maps to remove height control variations.
FS17.913	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS72.40	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.278	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.252	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.277	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone.	Seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. Mana provides a range of

				<p>commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs.</p> <p>The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area).</p> <p>A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided in support of this submission.</p>
FS17.945	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.105	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the



				submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS99.310	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.284	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.280	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept the changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission.	Generally supports the use of and spatial extent of the Mixed Use Zone; although Kāinga Ora is seeking that the proposed MUZ to the east of the Mungavin Interchange is rezoned to HRZ.
FS17.948	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.43	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.313	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.287	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.308	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept the changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission [in relation to MCZ].	Generally supports the use of the MCZ; although Kāinga Ora is seeking expansion to the zone to replace the LFRZ at the north of the city centre.
FS17.976	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.44	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.341	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.315	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.334	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Reduce the spatial extent of the LFRZ to the north of the city centre and rezone this area to MCZ.	Kāinga Ora is seeking the replacement of the LFRZ at the north of the city centre with the MCZ.
FS17.1002	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.158	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.367	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.341	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.335	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Accept the changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission. [Large Format Retail Zone]	Kāinga Ora is seeking the replacement of the LFRZ at the north of the city centre with the MCZ.
FS17.1003	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.45	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.368	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.342	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS76.336	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>It is acknowledged that this includes the area identified as the Whitireia Tertiary Education Precinct, which is also sought to be rehoused into the MCZ, with consequential changes to provisions to reflect the shift in chapters.</p>	<p>Kāinga Ora is seeking the replacement of the LFRZ at the north of the city centre with the MCZ.</p>
FS17.1004	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS99.369	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short</p>

			ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.343	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.3	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Policy 3 of the NPS sets out various requirements in respect of providing for increased densities and heights in the Central City, Metropolitan Centre Zones, and walkable catchments from existing and planned rapid transit stops, the edge of City Centre Zones and the edge of Metropolitan Centre Zones. It also directs councils to amend other residential zones to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in those zones. Within Variation 1, Porirua City Council have replaced the City Centre Zone with the Metropolitan Centre Zone to reflect

				Wellington City Council as being the City Centre Zone within the Wellington urban environment. Local Centre Zones and Neighbourhood Centre Zones have also been identified on the planning maps. Supports the application of an 800m walkable catchment for Metropolitan Centre Zones and existing or planned rapid transit stops. This distance recognises the critical importance of these matters in contributing towards a well-functioning urban environment where more people have easier access to more services. Supports the application of an 800m walkable catchment from the Local Centre Zone which has determined the zoning and density provisions adjacent these areas.
FS17.1037	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.391	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Allow	Kāinga Ora supports this submission, to the extent that it is consistent with Kāinga Ora's primary submission
OS109.1	Stephen and Anne Marie Booth On Behalf Of Stephen Booth	Oppose	Beachfront areas should not be included in the Medium Density Zone or should have a maximum building height of 2 storeys, specifically Karehana Bay in Plimmerton.	Bought a home to raise four children in Plimmerton in 1990 to live in a small established seaside village community with significant history, as opposed to a new developing area.



				<p>Three storey buildings on the flat beachfront areas would change the special character of the area.</p> <p>Higher buildings and greater density would lessen enjoyment of the home and the area.</p> <p>The area concerned about is registered as potentially affected by coastal and tsunami hazard. Council should have authority to assess development on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Limited trees and vegetation remains in the beachside areas of Karehana Bay and higher buildings would reduce vegetation further and shade areas of vegetation behind. It would set back the "bring back the birds in the backyard" project that has improved birdlife thanks to a great deal of community effort.</p> <p>Higher density would place more strain on drainage infrastructure which already struggles to cope with recent flooding events as an example.</p> <p>Parking on the waterfront area is already insufficient on summer days and higher density would strain this further and reduce the enjoyment of the beach for visitors and locals.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Access to driveways on the Karehana Bay waterfront is already hazardous especially for older people and children. Increased car movements in and out of driveways will make the narrow road more hazardous for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Crossing this busy beachfront road with parking only available on one side, will also become more hazardous especially for children and the elderly.</p>
FS17.521	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.144	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.2-New Provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS73.15	Radio New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>Amend planning maps to identify sites subject to RNZ's proposed Radiocommunication Transmission qualifying matter. The spatial extent required is demonstrated by the yellow line:</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including figure]</p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.324	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS76.384	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter and resulting changes sought to the planning maps.
OS76.50	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Rezone Mana commercial area as TCZ rather than LCZ and allow for commercial height of up to 10 Storeys (40m).	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.718	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.63	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing

				so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.77	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.101	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A

				Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS75.32	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.83	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.57	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS112.9	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Support	Seeks that Porirua Substation and Waitangirua Substation are identified on the 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;	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS76.402	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes 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.
OS112.11	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Identification of Porirua Substation and the Waitangirua Substation on the applicable	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

			planning maps with the land surrounding the sites being subject to Qualifying Matters so to enable development controls to be put in place through a Restricted Discretionary Activity status.	
--	--	--	--	--

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.4-Retain Zoning

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS3.1	Paul Winter	Oppose	Retain General Residential Zone for Aotea.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts need for some change but has concerns about impacts on character and amenity.</li> <li>• With Council having been directed to do this, it does not provide enough allowance for what is appropriate to a local community. Provides example of General Residential Zone substituted with Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>• Need to balance housing intensification with other objectives in local plans (such as maintaining or enhancing the level of community well being, quality urban design and adequate infrastructure).</li> <li>• How new subdivisions, e.g. the proposed development of the Northern Corridor, should only be granted resource consent under proposed guidelines for MRZ with existing subdivision remaining under</li> </ul>

				<p>GRZ guidelines. Similarly, development of a Master Plan Regeneration Process, as proposed for Eastern Porirua can deliver increased housing intensification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having lived in Aotea is supportive of the developer following guidelines in the Porirua Operative District Plan, with regards to amenity and character. Refers to a recent home purchase in Aotea with a quality of outlook and is concerned investment could be destroyed (from having 3-storey houses and up to 3 dwellings on each lot).</li> <li>• Refers to residential and commercial development/character in Aotea including how 1 and 2 storey homes in Aotea maximise access to views and light shafts. Also how a recent townhouse development does not dominate/adversely or impact amenities.</li> <li>• Pressure on infrastructure.</li> <li>• Impact on property values.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.6	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.



FS120.1	Baswa Surukanti	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>
OS21.1	Robin Auld	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports the high density plan for Plimmerton for the reasons being:

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More affordable for those needing to downsize and wanting to stay in the village.</li> <li>• Affordable for those wishing to live in a seaside village.</li> <li>• To be able to take advantage of nearby facilities, buses, trains, medical centre, supermarkets to name a few.</li> <li>• High decile Primary School. More affordable to a wider social mix.</li> </ul>
FS17.602	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS24.1	Peter and Fay Harrison	Oppose	Retain existing provisions [in Plimmerton].	Buildings will be too high and too dense for the areas. Parking will not be provided for. Character of Plimmerton will be compromised. Roading and infrastructure will not be able to cope. The Council should not just follow a blanket Government proposal be need to make decision in the best interest of the specific area. Will shade existing dwellings. Plimmerton is still a Village and should not become a high rise area. There should be no more building on areas close to the sea.
FS17.40	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS26.2	Kevin Clark	Oppose	Seeks that the land in the Plimmerton area be retained as Medium Density, but with the previous height limits.	The concept of six storied apartment blocks in this neighbourhood is strange. Generally all the sites are small residential sites suited to single unit dwellings. It will take many

				<p>years before the houses in question are demolished, and sites amalgamated to allow for economically viable apartment blocks to be built (they will need lifts) , to the detriment of adjoining owners. There may be some sense in greenfields developments to the north of Plimmerton, but even that is questionable.</p> <p>Why the land between Steyne Avenue and the beach is zoned High Density is puzzling. There are restrictions on the land relating to rising sea levels and tsunami areas, and I understand that getting building consents for any new buildings in this area will be almost impossible. Questions why it is zoned for High Density.</p>
FS17.48	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS27.3	Pukerua Holdings Limited	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports the proposed rezoning of the additional rural residential land within the Northern Growth Area Development. This will enable a more economically viable development, and critically unlock 50 hectares of stunning native bush in the north-eastern precinct of the Muri Road block, previously closed to the community
FS17.605	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS22.4	On Behalf of landowner SS Pointon	Support	Allow the whole submission	Support the submission by Pukerua Holdings Ltd (submitter 27) for the creation of the NGA. The support of the submitter is that it would be successful enable our submission to extend to extend the NGA area to include our land achievable.
--------	--------------------------------------	---------	----------------------------	---

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.5-Rezoning

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS8.1	Vanessa Robson	Oppose	Amend the designation of the strip along the beach side of the railway line at Plimmerton Beach to Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Plimmerton Beach has characteristics which make it unsuitable to be a HRZ: its recreational use, its position relative to the sun and the area adjacent to the beach being an inundation zone. The block next to the beach is also part of the Plimmerton Heritage Trail.</p> <p>1) Plimmerton Beach is the main recreational space for the area, so sunlight access should be retained there. 22m high buildings would shade the beach for most of the day in winter and for a good part of the day in summer. They may also bounce wind onto it.</p> <p>2) Access to views and sunlight would be more fairly shared if height limits tapered back from the beachfront. The 22m height limit of the HRZ could be on the inland side of the railway line.</p>

				<p>3) Sites adjacent to Plimmerton beach are in an inundation zone and so are unsuitable to be designated as a HRZ.</p> <p>4) The area at present has predominantly 1 and 2 storey houses, and is part of the Plimmerton Heritage Trail. 22m apartments blocks would have a significant negative effect regarding shade, wind and visual dominance, on the existing built environment.</p>
FS17.20	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.147	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
OS8.2	Vanessa Robson	Oppose	Designate the area along Plimmerton Beach (SW of the railway line along Steyne Ave) a special character area.	<p>Plimmerton Beach has characteristics which make it unsuitable to be a HRZ: its recreational use, its position relative to the sun and the area adjacent to the beach being an inundation zone. The block next to the beach is also part of the Plimmerton Heritage Trail.</p> <p>1) Plimmerton Beach is the main recreational space for the area, so sunlight access should be retained there. 22m high buildings would shade the beach for most of the day in winter and for a good part of the day in summer. They may also bounce wind onto it.</p> <p>2) Access to views and sunlight would be more fairly shared if height limits tapered back from the beachfront. The 22m height limit of the HRZ could be on the inland side of the railway line.</p> <p>3) Sites adjacent to Plimmerton beach are in an</p>

				<p>inundation zone and so are unsuitable to be designated as a HRZ.</p> <p>4) The area at present has predominantly 1 and 2 storey houses, and is part of the Plimmerton Heritage Trail. 22m apartments blocks would have a significant negative effect regarding shade, wind and visual dominance, on the existing built environment.</p>
FS17.21	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS9.1	Hana Robson Marsden	Oppose	Delete the variation 1 proposed changes along Plimmerton Beach	<p>The area between the road and the beach is prone to coastal erosion so it seems a bad idea to allow medium or high density housing to be built.</p> <p>The beach is the main recreation area for Plimmerton, and one of the things that makes Porirua special. This should be protected and not shaded by tall buildings to the North.</p> <p>The Plimmerton Farm subdivision will supply plenty of housing for the area, it doesn't seem necessary to change the feel of Plimmerton beach by allowing increased density at the beach.</p>
FS17.22	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS118.146	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
OS15.1	Joanna MacDonald	Oppose	In relation to the proposed high density residential zoning for Taupo Crescent, retain current provisions and delete this change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views in the street are some of the best in the Wellington district. These may be ruined by 6 storey buildings. This in turn will affect property prices negatively.</li> <li>• There is already totally inadequate parking up the Crescent. This will only be exacerbated by the proposal.</li> <li>• Plimmerton village is valued by its residents and visitors for its village atmosphere and retention of heritage buildings. This may be lost with high-rise apartments around.</li> <li>• The infrastructure (eg sewerage pipes) is 60 or more years old. It would not withstand a huge increase in population.</li> </ul>
FS17.35	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.148	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
OS22.1	On Behalf of landowner SS Pointon	Amend	Adjust the residential zone boundary of NGA to include two portions of land shown as areas A and B in submission.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	The draft structure plan shows two places of roading connection and two places of walkway connection on the southern boundary of the Pointon land. The topography of the Pointon land is not too dissimilar to that shown as proposed residential on the structure plan. Due to the land similarities', submitter considers

				that it would be appropriate at this stage to have the two land areas A and B in submission included in the proposed residential zone of the Northern Growth Area Plan Variation. While submitter understands that it is convenient to make zone boundaries coincide with underlying property boundaries, they consider that in this situation a better zone boundary can be defined by the site contours as shown.
OS28.1	Paremata Business Park	Amend	Include 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 ,27 and 29 Paremata Crescent into the Local Centre Zoning. This should also include extending the active frontage requirements. Or adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission, as necessary to give effect to this submission	These seven properties are bookended by the Local Centre Zone at each end. Including these as Local Centre Zone will increase the overall area of mixed use, create a cohesiveness to the streetscape, and will consequently improve the overall village character of the area. The sites are all along the northern side of Paremata Crescent.
FS17.607	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS31.1	Warrick Procter	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Opposes the rezoning of 4 Moana Road, Plimmerton, Porirua 5026 from General Residential to Medium Density Residential.
FS17.53	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS42.1	Mark Neeson	Oppose	Amend to change the zoning of that part of Penryn Reserve ((Pt Lot 20 DP 81419	The proposed zoning reflects an earlier intention by the PCC to sell this part of the



			and on the intersection of St Ives Drive and Padstow Place) shown as Medium Density Residential Zone to Open Space Zone.	<p>reserve. In December 2021 the Minister of Conservation declined the council's request to revoke the designation of the land as a reserve.</p> <p>This means that the land cannot be sold and remains as a reserve subject to the Reserves Act 1977. Hence, it is not legally appropriate to zone it as medium density residential. Doing so is also misleading as the land is not able to be sold and used for residential development.</p> <p>The reserve should retain and reflect the same zoning as balance of Penryn Reserve (it is one reserve).</p> <p>The use and zoning should also reflect, by of example, the nearby Bodmin Park.</p>
FS17.96	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS43.1	Emily Pike	Oppose	Medium Density Residential Zoning would be more suitable for the Plimmerton Waterfront than the High Density Residential Zone [HDRZ].	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Density Residential Zoning [HDRZ] has been inappropriately applied in Plimmerton and Medium Density Residential Zoning would be more suitable.</li> <li>• HDRZ along the Plimmerton waterfront is not conducive to the environmental changes being faced where the waterfront is subject to erosion and repeated flooding in serious storms; with climate change this is likely to worsen.</li> <li>• It would be prudent to maintain limits as need to move away from coastal</li> </ul>

				<p>living; issues with safely accommodating this lifestyle in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant Natural Areas should be assertively protected and ensuring resource consent for high density housing is a modest intervention.</li> <li>• HDRZ in Plimmerton has the potential to make irreversible changes to the character of the village. A sharp increase in residents without sufficient infrastructure risks overwhelming the limited resources and amenities including sufficient access to a primary school, parking, and a functioning sewage system.</li> <li>• A more measured approach would be implementing MDRZ along the coast which would allow the community to respond and adapt to more intensive residential structures through resource consent processes.</li> </ul>
FS17.97	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.149	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
OS66.1	Benjamin Colbert	Oppose	In the event that Porirua City Council sells the land at 97 Conclusion street, Porirua city council should offer the land in question for sale to the directly adjoining	Objects to the rezoning to Medium Density Residential, within a precinct that enables 18m high buildings as a permitted activity (no

			neighboring properties.	<p>resource consent required), specifically for 97 Conclusion Street, Formerly Limerick Reserve.</p> <p>The shape, topography, and orientation of the land does not lend itself well to viable residential development in isolation. It would be a very unusual type of development and is not suited to the character of the area. It currently provides an essential link between Conclusion St and Limerick Grove which supports the walkability of the neighborhood and it is unsuitable for further development. The residents of Limerick Grove and Conclusion street, and parents and students of Rangikura school will be adversely affected by proposed changes, including an increased risk to children at school pick up and drop off times, including requiring the removal of a Bus Stop. The proposed height limit is unsuitable. It means adjoining residential sections would be affected by shading from tall buildings in the morning, as would the school in the afternoons. Privacy of current residential properties and the school would be severely compromised.</p> <p>Has only just as of 12th of September, been alerted to this proposal and feeling under pressure on this issue. This has been not as effectively communicated as has been done previously. Made a proposal on Limerick Reserve in 2016 when this disposal was first investigated.</p>
OS66.2	Benjamin Colbert	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Objects to the rezoning to Medium Density Residential, within a precinct that enables 18m

				<p>high buildings as a permitted activity (no resource consent required), specifically for 97 Conclusion Street, Formerly Limerick Reserve. The shape, topography, and orientation of the land does not lend itself well to viable residential development in isolation. It would be a very unusual type of development and is not suited to the character of the area. It currently provides an essential link between Conclusion St and Limerick Grove which supports the walkability of the neighborhood and it is unsuitable for further development. The residents of Limerick Grove and Conclusion street, and parents and students of Rangikura school will be adversely affected by proposed changes, including an increased risk to children at school pick up and drop off times, including requiring the removal of a Bus Stop. The proposed height limit is unsuitable. It means adjoining residential sections would be affected by shading from tall buildings in the morning, as would the school in the afternoons. Privacy of current residential properties and the school would be severely compromised.</p> <p>Has only just as of 12th of September, been alerted to this proposal and feeling under pressure on this issue. This has been not as effectively communicated as has been done previously. Made a proposal on Limerick Reserve in 2016 when this disposal was first investigated.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

OS70.5	Paremata Residents Association	Oppose	Change the proposed High-Density Residential Zones identified, in Mana, Camborne and Plimmerton to MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zones, due to qualifying matters.	<p>Mana and parts of Plimmerton proposed as high-density residential zones are not suitable for this scale of intensification due to their vulnerability to the impacts of climate change and natural hazards.</p> <p>These areas are low lying and particularly vulnerable to sea level rise, storm surges, and coastal erosion; plus, the potential for natural disasters (tsunami zone, flooding and earthquake). Parts of Mana Esplanade has the potential for liquefaction and the southern part is in an earthquake fault zone. <b>These vulnerabilities should be considered Qualifying Matters.</b></p> <p>High Density Intensification is unsuitable for areas of steep topography in Porirua, particularly areas with soft soils prone to slips or settlement, such as Camborne.</p> <p>Meeting the criteria of distance to a train station and supermarket does not necessarily mean an area is suitable for intensification due to other factors.</p>
FS17.294	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS71.1	Silverwood Corporation Limited	Amend	While it is understood that the submission and further submission by Silverwood Corporation Limited (the submitter) on the Proposed District Plan will continue to apply to Variation 1, for the avoidance of doubt, the submitter formally adopts	Seeks that the 'Silverwood and Landcorp sites' be rezoned from Rural to 'Future Urban Zone'. See reasons set out in submission 172 and further submission 34 [to the Proposed District Plan].

			submission 172 and further submission 34 and the relief set out within for the purposes of Variation 1. The submitter acknowledges that Greenfield residential areas can be included within an IPI under sections 77G(4) and 80E(b)(iii) of the RMA.	
FS17.649	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS76.16	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Seek rezoning of land at 8-10 Champion Street to MRZ.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

FS17.684	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.65	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.49	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.23	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high

				density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.27	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Rezone land to the east of the Mungavin Interchange from Mixed Use Zone to HRZ.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.695	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.62	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora’s requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and



				contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.76	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.136	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.54	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons

				should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.60	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.205	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part and requests submission point be allowed in part, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.
FS127.34	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.30	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Expand spatial extent of MCZ by rezoning Large Format Retail Zone to the north of the city MCZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.698	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.137	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.

FS75.51	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.63	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.37	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>

OS76.37	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Extend spatial extent of LCZ in Paremata.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.705	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.138	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.

FS75.45	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.70	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.44	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>

OS76.44	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Extend spatial extent of the NCZ in Pukerua Bay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.712	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS47.23	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Oppose	<p>As this request is in two parts, we will address them separately.</p> <p><b>1. Expansion of the NCZ</b></p> <p>We acknowledge that there could be benefits to allowing the NCZ to be larger</p>	<p>We request that the part of the submission requesting that the maps be amended to allow buildings in the expanded NCZ be subject to Height Increase A be disallowed, and instead the maximum allowable height in this zone to be the same as that of residential buildings in the surrounding MDZ.</p>

		<p>that it currently is. The planned new housing to the south of Pukerua Bay will increase the demand for shopping and other social and commercial services in the area. Pukerua Bay is currently poorly served by commercial, retail and social services, and this will become worse as the local population grows. There is a NCZ planned in the new Pukerua Bay Structure Plan in the District Plan; however, it is limited in size and will likely better serve the communities being developed to the south. It will also be a considerable distance from the new houses in the Muri Block and the existing houses in Pukerua Bay, which would encourage people to drive there (or drive further to Mana or Porirua) for shopping. Our goal is to encourage walkable neighbourhoods, so a greater range of services closer to the existing and newest neighbourhoods could be beneficial.</p> <p>However, we note that part of the land within the expanded NCZ already includes some more intensive dwellings (smaller houses on small sections), which is something that ought to be encouraged in a suburb like Pukerua Bay. It would be a shame if they were lost in an expansion of the NCZ.</p>	<p>As discussed in our reasons, we have no objection to the potential to expand the existing HCZ to support the increase in services to the expected growing population in Pukerua Bay, and seek that part of the submission be allowed</p>
--	--	--	---



			<p><b>2. Increasing height allowable to Height Increase A</b></p> <p>We object to the submission that buildings in the NCZ could be up to 22 metres in height, for many of the same reasons we object to the proposal that 22m accommodation could be built; in particular, due to land stability and shading of surrounding areas. We believe 22m high commercial buildings in the middle of Pukerua Bay appear to be the consequence of the same one-size-fits-all approach KO has taken to the HDZ housing. We believe the same height limits allowed in MDZ housing ought to be appropriate for the NCZ.</p>	
FS74.139	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.38	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations

			the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.	that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.77	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.51	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.51	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Rezone northern extent of the city centre from LFRZ to MCZ.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act</li> </ul>

				<p>1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.719	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.143	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.31	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons

				should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.84	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.58	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.52	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Commensurate increase in spatial extent of High Density Residential Zone in surrounding area [due to expanded MCZ sought by Submitter]	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.720	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.64	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.78	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that

				the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.144	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.30	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.85	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time

			understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.59	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.53	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Rezone area of Mixed Use Zone to the east of the Mungavin Interchange (western extent of Rānui) to High Density Residential Zone.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.721	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.65	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.79	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of



				vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.145	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.29	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.86	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish

			payers and not those of central government	attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.60	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.54	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Rezone land at 8-10 Champion Street (and adjoining legal road) from Open Space to Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

FS17.722	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.66	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.80	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.146	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and

			Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.28	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.87	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.61	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high

				density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.55	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Expand the spatial extent of NCZ at Pukerua Bay.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.723	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.67	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and

				contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.81	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.147	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.27	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons

				should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.88	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.62	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.56	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Expand the spatial extent of LCZ at Paremata.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.724	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.68	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.82	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that



				the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.148	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.26	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.89	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time

			understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.63	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.120	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Rezone land on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange, at the western extent of Rānui from Mixed Use to High Density Residential.	<p>Opportunities for further high density housing should be explored to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres and Rapid Transit Stops in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Does not support the introduction of the qualifying matter applying to steep south facing sites and associated height restrictions. Seeks the removal of these areas from the mapped extent of the HRZ.</p> <p>Also seeks the rezoning of MUZ land to HRZ on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange to HRZ.</p>

FS17.788	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.151	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.153	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.127	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.160	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Rezone land at 8-10 Champion Street to MRZ from Open Space to MRZ.	Generally supports the MRZ mapping. In particular, supports the use and spatial

				<p>application of the MRZ across the urban residential environment (except where changes are sought to upzone locations from MRZ to HRZ, as shown on the attached maps) [maps attached to submission].</p> <p>Generally supports the use and spatial extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct within the MRZ but seeks some small increases in some locations to ensure the coverage includes sites in the MRZ that are within a 400m catchment of the Local Centre.</p> <p>Supports the proposed rezoning of land between 16 Mungavin Street and Champion Street to MRZ.</p> <p>Seeks an extension of the rezoning of land from Open Space to MRZ to also include land at 8-10 Champion Street, and the adjacent legal road.</p>
FS17.828	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.152	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.193	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their

			meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.167	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.216	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Extend spatial extent of Neighbourhood Centre Zone at Pukerua Bay, as shown on attached maps in Appendix 3 [to submission].	Generally supports the use of and spatial extent of the NCZ. However, seeks an extended footprint of the Neighbourhood Centre at Pukerua Bay. Also seeks consequential changes to the maps to include additional areas subject to Height Increase A, where the HRZ is extended through the submission around additional NCZ.
FS17.884	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.38	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation

				of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS74.154	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.249	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.223	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.276	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Seek the Mana commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone (proposed)	Seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. Mana provides a range of

			in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 3.	commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided in support of this submission.
FS17.944	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.41	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS74.104	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of

				the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS99.309	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.283	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high



				density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.278	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Accept the changes sought from Kāinga Ora to the planning maps as shown in Appendix 3 of this submission.	Seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. Mana provides a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided in support of this submission.
FS17.946	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.42	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.311	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time

			understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.285	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.306	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Expand the spatial extent of the MCZ to encompass the proposed LFRZ at the north of the city centre.	Generally supports the use of the MCZ; although Kāinga Ora is seeking expansion to the zone to replace the LFRZ at the north of the city centre.
FS17.974	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.157	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.339	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.313	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS86.1	Tracey Fleming	Oppose	<p>Remove the High Density Residential Zone in favour of Medium Density with more height control areas particularly on the seaward side of the railway corridor.</p>	<p>The higher buildings enabled by the proposed zoning will block view, create significant shading, change the beloved character and style of the village.</p> <p>The intense number / increase of residents would put unmanageable strain on the land, beach, sea and sea life (shellfish, fish, seaweed etc).</p> <p>The school grounds for the school children will rapidly disappear under buildings to accommodate the even greater increase in population.</p> <p>It would cause an even greater strain on Sewage and Stormwater reticulation and treatment.</p> <p>Such high density of building, people, vehicles</p>

				(including service vehicles), the subsequent noise increase would ruin the nature and the character of the village.
FS17.449	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.142	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
OS95.2	Porirua City Council	Amend	Rezone Lot 74 DP 50599 at the north-west corner of 87 Pikarere Street from OSZ to MRZ.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including map]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot 74 DP 50599 and lot 36 DP 50599 are being disposed of together and the reserve status of both sites has been revoked.</li> <li>• Lot 74 DP 50599 only has an area of 25 m2.</li> <li>• This site is no longer required for reserve purposes and therefore a more appropriate zoning is required.</li> <li>• Lot 36 DP 50599 is proposed to have a residential zoning and therefore it is appropriate for the corner of the site to have the same zoning rather than a spot zoning.</li> <li>• Gazette Notice revoking reserve status of Lot 74 DP 50599 is <a href="https://gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2021-ln890">https://gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2021-ln890</a></li> </ul>
FS17.1113	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS98.1	Mike Hopkins	Not Stated	<p>High density housing is not appropriate for the Plimmerton and Camborne areas at all, however, if it is to be pursued, then the boundary for a high density zone should not extend above the Grays Road/Taupo Crescent junction. Limiting intensification to below that level would allow some intensification while still protecting the flora and fauna of Lagden Reserve, the character of the Lagden Street, Mervyn Place and Arapawa Place area and the safety and security of residents.</p>	<p>The contents of the plan are quite alarming, specifically in respect of the proposal to permit major intensification of the Plimmerton and Camborne suburbs. The need to have more housing and to have it close to transport links is understood. However, intensifying the areas designated as High Density in the online map associated with the draft plan would result in pushing families further away from transport links, to be replaced by a younger demographic, whose lifestyles are probably better suited to central city living anyway.</p> <p>High density housing is not appropriate for Plimmerton or Camborne. The village feel of Plimmerton would be destroyed and the areas of Camborne designated for high density development in the District Plan simply do not support it.</p> <p>Notably, neither the consultation document nor online map contain rationale for the proposed zoning, i.e. why boundaries are set where they are. Provides an example, under the proposed zoning, of how their dwelling would sit in a medium density zone on the border of a high density zone and there is no explanation why the border is at this location and why number 4 (their residence) would be deemed a medium density area when number 5, across the street and actually further from the rail transport link, is designated suitable for</p>
--------	--------------	------------	---	---

				<p>high density. The proposed boundaries appear arbitrary and unsubstantiated.</p> <p>A key point is that none of the lots on Lagden Street, Mervyn Place, Arapawa Place or Taupo Crescent should be zoned for high density housing and the reasons for this are numerous and compelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Such a move would completely change the character of the area, to its detriment. These areas are family orientated suburbs and replacing this suburbia with high density housing will irrevocably change its nature for the worse;</li><li>• The infrastructure in this area will not support intensification. For example, the High Density rules in the consultation document do not stipulate a requirement for off street parking. Parking is already a problem on Lagden Street. The additional demands on street parking that will inevitably come from a switch to high density housing will not be sustainable and risks lives as emergency services will be hampered;</li><li>• Lagden Street, Mervyn Place, Arapawa Place and Taupo Crescent are all cul de sacs. The inevitable increase in vehicles from intensification will lead to a significant increase in congestion and pollution. Added to the inevitable parking problems, the streets will easily</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>become clogged and with only a single entry/exit point, emergency services will struggle to access dwellings swiftly and effectively. This is potentially a life-risking situation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Lagden Street, Mervyn Place, Arapawa Place and Taupo Crescent area is extremely steep. With climate change impacts expected to include more severe weather events, including more frequent and intense rain events, locating large, potentially six-storey structures on this steep area can only place excessive stress on the ground and risk structural movement and catastrophic landslides</li><li>• High density, six-storey buildings will also cut out much of the natural light that currently helps dry out the ground after severe rain events. Without this drying effect, the risk of landslides is exacerbated</li><li>• Intensification will inevitably result in a reduction in the number and size of private gardens. This will put excessive pressure on the small, public areas in the proposed high density zone and result in those areas, in effect, becoming dog parks, to the exclusion of being safe areas for children;</li><li>• The area lacks publicly accessible, green spaces. Other than the small Lagden and Taupo Reserves, there is no public greenery in the area. Taupo</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Reserve is simply a children’s play area. Lagden Reserve is dedicated to natural bush and a concrete tennis court. Best practice urban planning recognises the importance of green areas for relaxation and to improve sustainability. This is already limited. There simply isn’t enough usable, public, green space in the area to support increased intensification;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density housing in these areas would be a disaster for the local, endemic fauna. Lagden reserve is home to tui, pīwakawaka, kereru, kōtare and kākāriki. Surrounding the already small reserve with high density, six-storey housing would eliminate these species from their homes and the area</li> <li>• High density housing would also likely impact the native flora in the reserve. The micro-climate of the reserve would be devastated with six-storey buildings cutting out sunlight for much of the area</li> <li>• Constrained natural light from six-storey buildings overlooking existing dwellings will also be to the detriment of human health and wellbeing as well as create privacy risk.</li> </ul> <p>Designating Lagden Street, Mervyn Place, Arapawa Place and Taupo Crescent as suitable for high density development is dangerous for people and native flora and fauna.</p>
--	--	--	--	---



FS17.478	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.143	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.
OS104.1	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.497	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS116.1	Frances Dodge	Oppose	Remove the high density sub-precinct completely that allows buildings up to 22m high and retain the medium density standards.	22m height is too high for a suburban residential area. Shading and privacy effects would be beyond substantial and the area is far from a walkable distance to Porirua CBD. Given the lay of the land views would be blocked and the high rises that pop up would be vastly out of place and stick out like an eye sore. Plimmerton has a character and charm that should be preserved. It has a strong community feel that would be ruined if turned into inner city apartment block living. Sea level rises are very real. Why propose to develop an area so close to the ocean given the future outlook regarding climate change?
FS17.589	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.145	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.6-Precinct Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.162	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Retain the areas applied with MRZ-Residential Intensification Precinct as notified.	<p>Generally supports the MRZ mapping. In particular, supports the use and spatial application of the MRZ across the urban residential environment (except where changes are sought to upzone locations from MRZ to HRZ, as shown on the attached maps) [maps attached to submission].</p> <p>Generally supports the use and spatial extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct within the MRZ but seeks some small increases in some locations to ensure the coverage includes sites in the MRZ that are within a 400m catchment of the Local Centre.</p> <p>Supports the proposed rezoning of land between 16 Mungavin Street and Champion Street to MRZ.</p> <p>Seeks an extension of the rezoning of land from Open Space to MRZ to also include land at 8-10 Champion Street, and the adjacent legal road.</p>
FS17.830	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.195	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is

			changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.169	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.35	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.  [High-Density Sub-Precinct at Plimmerton Farm Zone]	Supports the extent of the High-Density Sub-Precinct as shown on the planning maps. The area subject to the zoning is located within an 800m walkable catchment to a rapid transit stop. This is in accordance with the requirements of Policy 3 (c) of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1069	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.7-Northern Growth Development Area Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS59.1	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Support	Generally supports identifying the land [422, 422A and 422B State Highway 1, Pukerua Bay] within the Northern Growth Area.	<p>If the Freshwater Management Areas (FMA) are to remain as part of the structure plan and variation, a balanced approach is required to provide a pathway to weigh potentially completing outcomes in supporting technical documents. It is also acknowledged that there are other planning instruments of particular relevance into this matter including the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-F) and the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. V1 should not foreclose opportunities for both ecological improvements and activities to support the feasibility of the urban development of the land given the planning instruments (including the NES-F) are moving targets. In relation to the specific wording in the rule framework, requiring an activity to be "in accordance with" the structure plan is too difficult a term to interpret at resource consent stage and may led to unintended blunt decisions. Suggests altering the wording from "in accordance with" to "consistent with" to recognise that structure plans are high level guidance documents and should not be treated as development plans to be replicated exactly in development proposals. In terms of any planting and restoration plan requirements, a fair and reasonable maintenance period should be required of the developer (i.e. three years).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

FS127.485	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter requests point be disallowed in whole.	Structure Plan should provide as much detail as possible for environmental and ecological protections so that developers must do everything to protect them
OS81.7	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	As part of Variation 1, Porirua City Council have re-zoned the Pukerua Bay Area of the Northern Growth Area (NGA) from part Future Urban Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The zoning will enable 1,500 new homes. Understands that this rezoning is supported by a Structure Plan and specific development area provisions. An integrated planning approach including the development of a transport strategy for the NGA as a whole is required to support the provision of quality, mixed-use, compact urban development that efficiently uses land, reduces travel distances and lowers reliance on private vehicles. This also contributes to achieving the government's transport outcomes.
FS17.1041	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.9	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Seeks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An integrated planning approach be progressed to support the zoning of the NGA as a whole package; and</li> <li>• This is achieved by the development of an overarching transport strategy to ensure land use is integrated in a manner that</li> </ul>	Acknowledges that development of the NGA is a regional priority and complex development opportunity identified by the Wellington Regional Leadership Committee and the intent is that the area will be urbanised given the operative urban zoning over the Plimmerton Farm area of the NGA. Supports this opportunity but considers coordination of urbanisation

			<p>provides a safe and connected transport network, and achieves the government and regional transport goals of emissions and VKT reductions.</p>	<p>across the NGA as a whole is critical to contributing to a well-functioning urban environment and associated transport outcomes. Supports an integrated approach to planning for the transport outcomes of the NGA. There is a lack of an overall transport strategy for the NGA. It is not clear how transport will be integrated between each area and how it will achieve government and regional transport goals of emissions and vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) reductions. Seeks that an integrated planning approach including a transport strategy to be developed to support the development of the NGA as a whole. Include identifying how development will be staged and how land use and transport will be integrated between each area, and any consequential changes to other provisions within the relevant chapters.</p>
FS17.1043	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS74.176	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	<p>Greater Wellington support provisions that provide for a transport system which reduces dependence on fossil fuels and private vehicles.</p>	<p>Greater Wellington agree that an integrated approach to providing for the transport network contributes to a well-functioning urban environment. Greater Wellington consider this strategy should support the development of a multi-modal transport network and be developed with public transport providers.</p>

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.8-Height Control Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS13.2	Carolyn Parris	Amend	Limit 3 storey to no more than 2 storey for numbers 20, 21, 22, 23 Sunset Parade, Plimmerton.	It will take away sunlight from 13a Motuhara Rd and put it in permanent shade. 13a is a much needed rental property. It will considerably remove the view from 13 and 13a Motuhara Rd Plimmerton. It will devalue the property.
FS17.32	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.57	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Remove identification of sites subject to the proposed qualifying matter relating to development of steep south facing slopes.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required</li> </ul>

				<p>under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.725	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.69	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.83	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south



				facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS74.111	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS75.25	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.90	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.64	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.119	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Remove identification of sites subject to a shading qualifying matter on sloping sites with steep south facing topography. Remove provisions related to this matter from the Plan.	<p>Opportunities for further high density housing should be explored to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres and Rapid Transit Stops in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Does not support the introduction of the qualifying matter applying to steep south facing sites and associated height restrictions. Seeks the removal of these areas from the mapped extent of the HRZ.</p> <p>Also seeks the rezoning of MUZ land to HRZ on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange to HRZ.</p>
FS17.787	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.14	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	The whole of this submission should be disallowed.	Toka Tū Ake supports restrictions on development on steep slopes in order to reduce land sliding hazard. Though the provision in the Proposed District Plan relates to minimizing shading of surrounding residences, we consider that the provision also acts to limit development

				on slopes which may be subject to landslide hazard and should therefore be retained.
FS74.116	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.152	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.126	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.161	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Remove identification of sites that are subject to a shading qualifying matter on sloping sites with steep south facing	Generally supports the MRZ mapping. In particular, supports the use and spatial application of the MRZ across the urban residential environment (except where

			topography. Remove provisions related to this shading matter.	changes are sought to upzone locations from MRZ to HRZ, as shown on the attached maps) [maps attached to submission]. Generally supports the use and spatial extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct within the MRZ but seeks some small increases in some locations to ensure the coverage includes sites in the MRZ that are within a 400m catchment of the Local Centre. Supports the proposed rezoning of land between 16 Mungavin Street and Champion Street to MRZ. Seeks an extension of the rezoning of land from Open Space to MRZ to also include land at 8-10 Champion Street, and the adjacent legal road.
FS17.829	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.117	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.194	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.168	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.217	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Amend on the maps that additional NCZ identified will be subject to Height Increase A.	Generally, supports the use of and spatial extent of the NCZ. However, seeks an extended footprint of the Neighbourhood Centre at Pukerua Bay. Also seeks consequential changes to the maps to include additional areas subject to Height Increase A, where the HRZ is extended through the submission around additional NCZ.
FS17.885	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.250	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has

			proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.224	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.244	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Changes to maps to remove height control variations as a consequential change to reflect submission on heights is sought [in relation to LCZ].  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	Seeking an increase in the height limit across the zone, to 22m, and seeks consequential changes to the maps to remove height control variations.
FS17.912	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.277	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.251	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS103.1	Claire and Brad Keenan	Not Stated	35 Terrace Road should not be considered as being a Height Variation Control Area.	<p>Submitter's property appears to be one of only a few within the new Medium Density Zone subject to a height restriction. Objects to this, and seeks additional information as to how this qualifying matter has been determined.</p> <p>Correspondence from Cuttris provided by submitter in support of objection to [the] property at 35 Terrace Road being placed under a shading height restriction. Submitter asserts that an error has been made in the PCC calculations. Submitter states that the correspondence from Cuttris states that [the property's] slope is neither south facing by definition, nor does it meet</p>

				<p>the 15 degree threshold (stated on page 4 of the Urban Design Memo).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
--	--	--	--	---

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.9-Residential Intensification Precinct Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS64.7	Brian Warburton	Amend	<p>Seeks that, as far as the MRZ-RIP in Titahi Bay and the 'accessibility' parameter of the NPS-UD are concerned, the Council should discount St Pius School.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments where relevant]</p>	<p>The Council's online consultation document and maps suggest that a substantial part of Titahi Bay is suitable for rezoning as 'MRZ Residential Intensification Precinct' or, 'MRZ-RIP'. I understand that the delineation of the MRZ-RIP is based on three simple parameters: namely, proximity to a supermarket, proximity to public transport and proximity to a school. Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) refers to there being, "as a minimum", "good accessibility for all people [my emphasis] between housing ... community services ..." The Ministry for the Environment has produced this document, 'Understanding and implementing intensification provisions for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development' [<a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/Understanding-and-implementingintensification-provisions-for-NPS-UD.pdf">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/Understanding-and-implementingintensification-provisions-for-NPS-UD.pdf</a>] This document, along with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD, suggests that the assessment should relate to an 'accessibility' parameter, not a simple 'proximity' parameter. As far as the MRZ-RIP in Titahi Bay is concerned I submit a simple 'proximity' parameter distorts the analysis</p> <p>In broad terms, about 93.7% of people in New Zealand do not affiliate themselves with the Roman Catholic religion, and about 48% have no religious affiliation at all. This being the case, St Pius School is likely to</p>



				<p>be 'inaccessible' to more than 90% of the population. The Government clearly anticipates that additional residential development potential should only be provided if societal demands are met. If intensified development was to occur in the part of the MRZ-RIP in Titahi Bay that is further than 800m from Kura Street School, but closer than 800m to St Pius School, then this Government expectation will not be provided for, and the outcomes sought from the Amendment Act and the NPS-UD will not be achieved.</p> <p>The limit of the MRZ-RIP in Titahi Bay must be amended to reflect the fact that primary school education for about 90% of children is not accessible at St Pius School. And on this basis, the amended boundary for the MRZ-RIP should more or less correspond to the attached plan, which shows (as pale-yellow shading) [refer to original submission] land that should be excluded from MRZ-RIP.</p> <p>I support the general concept of residential intensification if the amendment to the limits of the MRZ-RIP in Titahi Bay are made as outlined, but also subject to previous comment about the suitability of the land for development with respect to other resource management matters - for example, the three-waters (in particular wastewater) servicing.</p> <p>Council Officers' Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation  1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. Council officers' response to my comment on the draft has been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning and precincts determine development patterns over the long term.</li> <li>• They need to be considered in this context.</li> <li>• St Pius primary school represents a long-term physical resource within this urban environment.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the school’s current admissions policy gives preference to Catholic children, this may change over time, but it is unlikely that the school will close or move</li> </ul> <p>My Counter Argument. I agree that implementing resource management planning without knowledge of what might happen in the future is problematical, as the council officers have intimated. That is why the RMA allows for district plans to be changed, as and when required to respond to changed circumstances. In popular planning terminology a plan is supposed to be a “living document”. Uncertainty about the future should not be a reason to allow development to occur where there is no substantive evidential rationale based on our current understanding of the environmental parameters. This seems to be what the council planner is suggesting. To do this, could be described as ‘planning by chance’ (a lottery, if you like) with environmental degradation being the potential risk outcome.</p> <p>Allowing high density residential development to occur further than 800m from a school which is inaccessible to the entire population does not have any rationale justification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council’s own website refers to 800m walkable distance.</li> <li>• The MfE’s guidance refers to an 800m walkable distance.</li> <li>• Other councils are adopting the 800m accessibility test as per MfE’s guidance.</li> <li>• A large proportion of the population would consider that St Pius School is not ‘accessible’.</li> <li>• The NES-UD test is about accessibility. It is not about proximity.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.273	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS76.164	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Seek an increase to the spatial extent of MRZ-RIP to include areas shown as “MRZ-Residential Intensification Precincts” which are within 400m of the Local Centre – as shown on the maps in Appendix 3 [to submission].	Generally supports the MRZ mapping. In particular, supports the use and spatial application of the MRZ across the urban residential environment (except where changes are sought to upzone locations from MRZ to HRZ, as shown on the attached maps) [maps attached to submission]. Generally supports the use and spatial extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct within the MRZ but seeks some small increases in some locations to ensure the coverage includes sites in the MRZ that are within a 400m catchment of the Local Centre. Supports the proposed rezoning of land between 16 Mungavin Street and Champion Street to MRZ. Seeks an extension of the rezoning of land from Open Space to MRZ to also include land at 8-10 Champion Street, and the adjacent legal road.
FS17.832	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.153	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.197	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities.

			meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.171	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.10-Flood Hazard Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS14.1	The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Trust Board	Oppose	The Natural Hazard – Ponding Overlay be removed from Lot 4 DP 54351 and that part of the adjoining road reserve which slopes down to the carriageway.	<p>Relates to the proposed inclusion of the Natural Hazard – Ponding overlay over Lot 4 DP 54351 (unnumbered Okowai Road, on the corner of Okowai Road and Whitford Brown Avenue). The inclusion of the Natural Hazard – Ponding Overlay over Lot 4 DP 54351 (and the adjoining road berms) is opposed.</p> <p>Recognition that the Natural Hazard – Ponding Overlay may have been determined through a desk-top analysis of LIDAR data and a site-specific assessment not undertaken due to time constraints. The Council assessment may therefore not</p>

				<p>have identified that the ponding is occurring on a developed platform.</p> <p>The subject site is currently undeveloped. The site was used as a Ministry of Works yard and for filling during the construction of the Motorway network during the 1960's/1970s and the site was levelled in preparation for future development. No stormwater drainage infrastructure was installed at that time. Since then, the site has remained undeveloped and is now covered in a range of mainly pest or wilding species. Contamination remediation was undertaken on the site in 2018 in preparation for its development.</p> <p>Resource consent for the development of a Meetinghouse on the site was obtained in 1998 but this was not progressed. A team has been appointed to undertake the design and obtain resource consents for a new religious facility on this site.</p> <p>The site at its southern end is at grade with Okowai Road. Okowai Road then descends to the north and, along the Whitford Brown Avenue boundary, the Church site is elevated some 10m above the carriageway. The steep bank from the Church boundary down to the Whitford Board Avenue carriage is partly covered in mature pine</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>trees. The latest topographical survey of the site is attached [to the submission].</p> <p>Given its elevated position and that there are no waterbodies within the site or immediately alongside it, the site is not within a flood plain. The proposed Natural Hazard – Ponding Overlay on the site covers part of the existing formed platform. Near the northern and north-eastern boundary, the overlay then appears to cover an area that drops steeply towards the carriageways. The ponding is shown on a currently undeveloped platform, it is not a natural hazard. Ponding only occurs because this part of the site has been formed and left flat, ready for development, and the stormwater drainage which would occur at the time of building development has not yet been installed. The ponding is not a “natural” hazard. Ponding would not occur in those areas which slope down towards the carriageway.</p> <p>Awareness that stormwater drainage will need to be considered as part of the detailed design process. The ponding which is currently occurring on the platform will be addressed as part of the site design and stormwater management on this site can be practically installed. • It is unreasonable for Council to impose a Natural Hazard overlay on an undeveloped urban site when that site has been modified ready for</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				development, but that development has not occurred to date.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.34	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS46.1	Debra Ashton	Amend	Seeks removal of flood hazard ponding overlay from 300c Paremata Road	Submitter considers ponding overlay was applied in error. Ponding mapping appears to be undertaken without considering the ameliorative works undertaken by council in August 2019 at a cost of \$30,000, paid for by council. PCC has already installed new drainage on the property. The nature of these works included the installation of commercial grade stormwater pipes, sumps and a non- return flap on the outlet pipe. This has eliminated any flood hazard and risks as is evident with on the ground conditions. This issue was brought to the attention of CEO Wendy Walker and Mayor Anita Baker who thankfully, were involved in helping to resolve this matter.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]
FS99.22	Alan Collett	Support	Seeks all of the submission be allowed.	Support the complete submission. Again, evidence that the as built drainage data provided by PCC to Wellington Water to based their flood modelling on is flawed. How many more instances of this will be found?

OS48.1	John Sharp	Oppose	Delete Flood Hazard -ponding at 64 Exploration Way, Whitby.	Submitter has lived at property for 31 years and no flooding or ponding has occurred. Submitter understands Wellington Water has yet to do the modelling for Whitby on the 1% Probability of the 100 year flood and yet the Council is showing this on the Proposed District Plan. Contours based on GIS of the land show the outlet crest meters lower. Submitter has employed an engineer to support submission to undertake a survey and give a full report.
FS17.121	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS48.2	John Sharp	Support	Seeks all of the submission be allowed.	[Refers to issues outlined elsewhere in further submission] this time contour considerations in regard to the flood mapping and modelling.
FS99.31	Alan Collett	Support	Seeks all of the submission be allowed	Support the complete submission. As [outlined in elsewhere in further submission] above, this time contour considerations in regard to the flood mapping and modelling.
OS74.73	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend to include ponding zones and overland flow paths in flood hazard overlays in the Northern Growth Area.	It is important to identify all areas subject to flooding hazard in Northern Growth Area. Currently, the variation does not incorporate ponding zones and overland flow paths in Northern Growth Area. These areas will be subject to flooding and this should be shown on the Plan. This request is sought by Submitter to ensure the District Plan has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 29.



FS17.398	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.54	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 73 of OS74	Support amendment of flood hazard mapping by including ponding zones and overland flow paths in flood hazard overlays in the Northern Growth Area.  Good planning demands that we identify all areas subject to flooding hazard in the Northern Growth area. Identifying and mapping ponding zones and overland flow path areas will avoid a lot of grief in future.
FS76.386	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Consistent with its primary submission on the PDP, Kāinga Ora opposes flood hazard maps being included within the District Plan. Consistent with the submissions on the PDP, Kāinga Ora remain of the view that the flood hazard mapping should sit outside of the Plan as a non-statutory layer.
OS76.58	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Remove increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as</li> </ul>

				<p>to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.726	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.7	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	The whole of this submission should be disallowed.	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the Porirua Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk. Toka Tū Ake supports the use and expansion of regulatory flood-hazard maps based on up-to date modelling by Wellington Water.
FS74.106	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that all flood hazard maps are included in the District Plan, including the increased spatial extent proposed in Variation 1 and Proposed Plan Change 19.	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS. Retaining the hazard overlays in the plan provides a clear and transparent means for incorporating risk-based natural hazards planning into the provisions and ensures changes to these maps are subject to

				scrutiny through the publicly notified processes. It also gives certainty about the hazards affecting different areas in the district and where the hazard provisions apply. Removing flood hazard overlays from the District Plan does not fulfil best practice hazard planning or properly give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, Regional Hazard Management Strategy or national guidance.
FS75.24	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.91	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood

				mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.68	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is disallowed, and that increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is retained in the plan change.	We oppose the removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around the areas that will be impacted by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards.
FS127.65	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS95.1	Porirua City Council	Support	Flood hazard mapping should be updated to take into account any recent changes in catchment hydrology. This is including, but not limited to, new lidar data which is due in late November 2022 (due to be flown in late September/early October 2022).	There are a number of large developments underway in Porirua that may impact hydrology, especially in Whitby. It is important that flood hazard maps are based on up-to-date stormwater catchment modelling. This will help to ensure that the flood hazard maps are as up-to-date as possible when the plan is made operative.
FS17.1112	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.17	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Support	Whole of the submission should be allowed	Toka Tū Ake support updating natural hazard maps within the District Plan as and when new information becomes available.
FS74.178	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek relief to update hazard mapping which reflects most recent information available.	Greater Wellington support a risk-based approach to natural hazards, and considers that the request to update mapping to take into account flood hazards is appropriate to support well-informed planning decisions.

FS76.397	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Consistent with its primary submission on the PDP, Kāinga Ora opposes this submission point. It is acknowledged that the Council seeks to review and update the flood hazard mapping information, but Kāinga Ora remain of the view that the flood hazard mapping should sit outside of the Plan as a non-statutory layer.
FS99.33	Alan Collett	Support	Seeks the whole submission be allowed.	As stated [elsewhere in further submission] input data to flood modelling is not accurate and submitter welcomes a complete review.
OS99.12	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks the flood zone overlay at 42 Gray Street to be reviewed.	Opposed to the Variation in relation to flood hazard mapping in Pukerua Bay, especially in the vicinity of Pukemere Way and Gray Street. The mapping is flawed and is not reflective to the true topography of the area.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.490	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.382	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests that the point be allowed.	Flood mapping needs to accurately reflect the true risk and be consistent with the actual drains etc that are in Gray Street as the information used to create maps was not correct.
OS115.1	D Suzi Grindell	Not Stated	That the designation Flood Detention be removed from the area in front of 21 Langwell Place northwards to the macrocarpa trees along Papakowhai Road.	Outlines having lived at the property for over 40 years and in previous submissions has raised mapping issues for the property due to out-of-date topographic mapping, with example given in relation to PCC

				<p>tsunami maps. Given this inaccuracy raises comments/concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small floods and run off, including that finds zoning of an areas in front of the section is exaggerated. Also that in general rainfall does not flood in the area marked flood detention, and sufficient drainage system installed - any possible problem from direct rainfall flooding is near insignificant.</li> <li>• Has taken care taken to ensure drain grating at bottom of cul de sac is kept clear of debri. Also to clear the culvert mouth at the bottom of the walkway to ensure free draining. In doing this there has never been flooding from this source over the area in front of the property.</li> </ul> <p>Experience two significant floods across Papakowhai Road in the 40 years lived there and these occurred in the last 15 years, (around the foot of Romesdale and Brora roadways), and smaller washes across the road but not enough to stop traffic. Outlines how floods at the bottom of Romesdale, resulted as much from a number of issues [relating to]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of capacity in the tidal cut-offs.</li> <li>• Lack of clearing drain gratings.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipes that service gratings on either side of Papakowahi Road at a low point south of the bus park, also seem to be almost blocked up.</li> <li>• In requesting that the flood designation only be removed to the macrocarpas: with the cut-offs now unable to absorb all the water a high tide water does pond; not necessarily over the road but enough to be interesting.</li> </ul> <p>If maintenance of the full draining system (not just a gutter clean) was thoroughly done, water could get away rapidly, and would help those who live by and all who use Papakowhai Road.</p> <p>Also notes that every time there is heavy rain, there is a fountaining of water which runs milky from the cliff facing Papakowhai Road. Identifies issues with this and asks who can solve this problem and that cannot relate this to anything on the maps.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.585	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS115.2	D Suzi Grindell	Not Stated	It would be good if the scheme could identify areas of storm flow of unknown source.	Outlines having lived at the property for over 40 years and in previous submissions has raised mapping issues for the property due to out-of-date topographic mapping, with example given in relation to PCC

		<p>[Refer to original submission, for full decision requested]</p>	<p>tsunami maps. Given this inaccuracy raises comments/concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small floods and run off, including that finds zoning of an areas in front of the section is exaggerated. Also that in general rainfall does not flood in the area marked flood detention, and sufficient drainage system installed - any possible problem from direct rainfall flooding is near insignificant.</li> <li>• Has taken care taken to ensure drain grating at bottom of cul de sac is kept clear of debri. Also to clear the culvert mouth at the bottom of the walkway to ensure free draining. In doing this there has never been flooding from this source over the area in front of the property.</li> </ul> <p>Experience two significant floods across Papakowhai Road in the 40 years lived there and these occurred in the last 15 years, (around the foot of Romesdale and Brora roadways), and smaller washes across the road but not enough to stop traffic. Outlines how floods at the bottom of Romesdale, resulted as much from a number of issues [relating to]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of capacity in the tidal cut-offs.</li> <li>• Lack of clearing drain gratings.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipes that service gratings on either side of Papakowahi Road at a low point south of the bus park, also seem to be almost blocked up.</li> <li>• In requesting that the flood designation only be removed to the macrocarpas: with the cut-offs now unable to absorb all the water a high tide water does pond; not necessarily over the road but enough to be interesting.</li> </ul> <p>If maintenance of the full draining system (not just a gutter clean) was thoroughly done, water could get away rapidly, and would help those who live by and all who use Papakowhai Road.</p> <p>Also notes that every time there is heavy rain, there is a fountaining of water which runs milky from the cliff facing Papakowhai Road. Identifies issues with this and asks who can solve this problem and that cannot relate this to anything on the maps.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.586	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS115.3	D Suzi Grindell	Not Stated	Up-to-date topography would give some trust in the mapping accuracy if it is to be used to determine flooding.	Outlines having lived at the property for over 40 years and in previous submissions has raised mapping issues for the property due to out-of-date topographic mapping, with example given in relation to PCC

		<p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>tsunami maps. Given this inaccuracy raises comments/concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small floods and run off, including that finds zoning of an areas in front of the section is exaggerated. Also that in general rainfall does not flood in the area marked flood detention, and sufficient drainage system installed - any possible problem from direct rainfall flooding is near insignificant.</li> <li>• Has taken care taken to ensure drain grating at bottom of cul de sac is kept clear of debri. Also to clear the culvert mouth at the bottom of the walkway to ensure free draining. In doing this there has never been flooding from this source over the area in front of the property.</li> </ul> <p>Experience two significant floods across Papakowhai Road in the 40 years lived there and these occurred in the last 15 years, (around the foot of Romesdale and Brora roadways), and smaller washes across the road but not enough to stop traffic. Outlines how floods at the bottom of Romesdale, resulted as much from a number of issues [relating to]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of capacity in the tidal cut-offs.</li> <li>• Lack of clearing drain gratings.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipes that service gratings on either side of Papakowahi Road at a low point south of the bus park, also seem to be almost blocked up.</li> <li>• In requesting that the flood designation only be removed to the macrocarpas: with the cut-offs now unable to absorb all the water a high tide water does pond; not necessarily over the road but enough to be interesting.</li> </ul> <p>If maintenance of the full draining system (not just a gutter clean) was thoroughly done, water could get away rapidly, and would help those who live by and all who use Papakowhai Road.</p> <p>Also notes that every time there is heavy rain, there is a fountaining of water which runs milky from the cliff facing Papakowhai Road. Identifies issues with this and asks who can solve this problem and that cannot relate this to anything on the maps.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.587	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.11-Natural Hazards Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS37.1	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Amend	Include areas of well defined, distributed, and uncertain (if appropriate) fault rupture within the Fault Rupture Zone Overlay in the Planning Maps. If the Fault Rupture Zone Overlay contains areas of low, medium and high hazard ranking, add these hazard ranking zones to the Planning Maps.	<p>The Ohariu Fault passes through an area which has been rezoned for high density residential development, and the Hospital Zone. It is unclear from the proposed planning map where and how development is restricted to limit the risk posed by the fault.</p> <p>Fault Avoidance Zones are recommended by MfE guidelines on planning around active faults. These zones should avoid development with 20 m of an active fault and should include any areas of uncertainty and distributed fault rupture. In accordance with the MfE guidelines, submitter recommends that defined, distributed, and uncertain zones should be mapped to show the uncertainties and where further investigations may be required.</p> <p>The Ohariu Fault Hazard Overlay needs to be clarified or amended to reflect the rules which are in place within this overlay. In particular, the operative plan has differing restrictions for subdivision, building and infrastructure within low, medium and high hazard zones. It is noted in the Section 32 (2020) report that the Ohariu Fault Hazard Overlay has low, medium and high hazard zones within it, with the highest restriction</p>

				<p>being within 20 m of the fault. However in the Proposed Planning Map active faults are only depicted as a single Fault Rupture Zone of varying width, and supporting documents are not available to explain why the overlay has been mapped like this.</p> <p>If the width of the Fault Rupture Zone within the High Density Residential Zone represents a 20 m exclusion zone around a wide, distributed or unconstrained part of the Ohariu Fault, then residential development and sensitive activities – including hospitals - should be avoided within this area. If, however, the Fault Rupture Zone contains varying levels of hazard and restriction, and the Ohariu Fault is well constrained and discrete in this area, then these zones should be presented in the planning maps to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Submitter outlines that they were unable to access the GNS Science Report XXX as referenced in the s32 report, and as a result could not confirm the approach taken.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS74.91	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington seek amendments to the way in which the Fault Rupture hazards are managed within the low-hazard portion of the Ohariu Fault overlay. We would support provision for site-specific investigation when	Greater Wellington agree that further clarification of the Fault Rupture Zone Overlay is required to understand the potential effects on intensified development. We support provision for site-specific investigation when building in low-

			building in low-hazard portions of the Ohariu Fault Rupture zone.	hazard portions of the Ohariu Fault Rupture zone. Greater Wellington support the risk-based approach to natural hazards taken in the Proposed District Plan, however this overlay and its associated provisions should be amended to ensure fault rupture hazards are appropriately assessed and managed for intensification. These changes should have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Policy 51.
FS123.1	Heriot Drive Ltd	Support	Seeks that submission OS37.1 be allowed in full recognizing that to do so will require substantive as yet undrafted changes to the PDP planning maps and fault hazard provisions.	Support all parts of submission OS37.1. In particular that the Ohariu fault be delineated on the planning maps according to fault complexity as identified in the GNS science report referenced in the s32 report (Porirua Fault Trace Study “Litchfield NJ, Van Dissen RJ GNS 2014) and consistent with MFE guidelines “Planning for development of land on or close to active faults” (Kerr J et al. MFE July 2003).  Also support clarification and amendment of the rules in the Ohariu Fault Hazard Overlay to reflect fault complexity.  The EQC submission OS37.1 is entirely consistent with submissions made by Heriot Drive Ltd (Submission 156) and Raiha Properties Ltd (Submission 157) to the proposed Porirua District Plan (PDP). The relief sought by EQC is in accordance with good RMA planning practice as recommended by MFE. The GNS report

				<p>referenced in the s32 report has classified the Ohariu fault along its length according to differing fault complexities. It is consistent with the MFE guidance to map the fault according to complexity. The PDP has not adopted the approach recommended by MFE nor incorporated the fault complexity zones identified in the advice provided by GNS.</p> <p>The proposed Ohariu Fault Rupture Zone in the PDP impinges on the properties owned by Heriot Drive Ltd and Raiha Properties Ltd. Therefore, any amendments to the planning maps or the natural hazard provisions of the PDP in respect of the Ohariu Fault Rupture Zone may have implications for those properties.</p>
OS37.2	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Amend	<p>A regulatory Liquefaction hazard overlay, such as that available from the Greater Wellington Regional Council should be included in the planning maps with restrictions on development implemented in high-risk areas.</p>	<p>Some areas of Porirua are at high risk of liquefaction in the event of an earthquake, which can be seen in the Greater Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Hazard Map. One of these areas overlaps with an area which has been rezoned for high density residential development. Another overlaps with an area which has been rezoned for medium density residential development (see attached appendix – Figure 1).</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that certain building types are more susceptible to damage by liquefaction. Increased floor size, height and an irregular footprint increase the risk of liquefaction damage. Severe</p>

				<p>liquefaction under the foundations of a building during an earthquake can cause it to become uninhabitable and require complete rebuilding, even if the building does not suffer shaking damage. This leads to deconstruction waste and increased embodied carbon, reconstruction waste and resource, and reduced wellbeing of those waiting for their house to be deconstructed and rebuilt. Buildings of up to 22 m tall are allowed in the High-density Residential Zone, which are at increased risk in a high liquefaction risk area. These higher rise buildings may accommodate many families who then need to be relocated during any deconstruction and reconstruction process.</p> <p>While foundation types as specified in the Building Act can reduce damage from liquefaction, it is important to also reduce risk by appropriate zoning. Property damage and associated disruption to life and wellbeing can be further reduced by avoiding intensification in areas at high risk of liquefaction.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS76.359	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	<p>Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing effects from natural hazards but opposes this submission seeking inclusion of liquefaction hazard maps and associated provisions. Kāinga Ora considers that if the evidence supports a managed approach to this</p>



				hazard, then this should be a matter considered outside of the IPI process.
FS123.2	Heriot Drive Ltd	Support	Seeks that submission OS37.2 be allowed in full and that a Liquefaction Hazard overlay be applied to the planning maps together with associated policies and rules.	<p>Support all parts of submission 37.2.</p> <p>The EQC submission OS37.2 is entirely consistent with submissions made by Heriot Drive Ltd (Submission 156) and Raiha Properties Ltd (Submission 157) to the proposed Porirua District Plan (PDP). Those submissions stated:</p> <p>“we seek that a more holistic approach be taken to addressing the risk to buildings and property from seismic events including liquefaction, slope failure and ground shaking rather than the single focus on fault rupture.” Submissions 156 and 157 also noted that there is an apparent inconsistency between the approach taken in the PDP and the approaches taken in relevant Greater Wellington Regional Council natural hazard strategies and plans. The EQC submission seeks, in part, to address that inconsistency.</p>
OS37.4	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Amend	A regulatory landslide hazards overlay should be developed and included in the planning maps with restrictions on development implemented in high-risk areas. At a property level, this could include providing a policy for the ‘line’ to be contested, similar to the Slope Instability Management Areas in the Christchurch District Plan.	<p>Porirua is at risk of landslides, due to the high rainfall, earthquake risk, and high density of slopes steeper than 20°. The Porirua Proposed District Plan only considers slope instability in rules for earthworks, restricting earthworks on slopes greater than 34°, and limiting heights of earthworks.</p> <p>Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay and restricting development within high-hazard</p>

				<p>areas will preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure.</p> <p>It is important to take this hazard into account when planning intensification and development projects to reduce the future risk to life, property and wellbeing.</p>
FS76.361	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	<p>Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing effects from natural hazards but opposes this submission seeking inclusion of landslide hazard overlay in the planning maps and associated provisions. Kāinga Ora considers that if the evidence supports a managed approach to this hazard, then this should be a matter considered outside of the IPI process.</p>
OS76.84	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Remove the proposed additional areas of natural hazard flooding overlay(s) from the District Plan, and instead hold this information in non-statutory GIS maps.	<p>Supports a risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards, however, opposes the inclusion of further flood hazard overlays within the maps as part of the District Plan.</p> <p>Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards. Kāinga Ora accepts that it is appropriate to include rules in relation to flood hazards but seeks that the rules are not linked to static maps.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory</p>

				maps. The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA. Notes that there is no formal requirement for flooding overlay maps to be included within a district plan and also notes that the National Planning Standards 2016 – Mapping Standard Table 20 includes a number of specific overlay and other symbols, but none relate to flooding.
FS17.752	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.8	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	The whole of this submission should be disallowed.	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the Porirua Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory map sopens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk. Toka Tū Ake supports the use and expansion of regulatory flood-hazard maps based on up-to date modelling by Wellington Water.
FS74.107	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that all flood hazard maps are included in the District Plan, including the increased spatial extent	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.

			proposed in Variation 1 and Proposed Plan Change 19.	Retaining the hazard overlays in the plan provides a clear and transparent means for incorporating risk-based natural hazards planning into the provisions and ensures changes to these maps are subject to scrutiny through the publicly notified processes. It also gives certainty about the hazards affecting different areas in the district and where the hazard provisions apply. Removing flood hazard overlays from the District Plan does not fulfil best practice hazard planning or properly give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, Regional Hazard Management Strategy or national guidance.
FS99.117	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.69	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is	We oppose the removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays because

			disallowed, and that increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is retained in the plan change.	these overlays provide certainty around the areas that will be impacted by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards.
FS127.91	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.85	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Seek for the flood hazard overlay maps to not be included in the District Plan.	<p>Supports a risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards, however, opposes the inclusion of further flood hazard overlays within the maps as part of the District Plan.</p> <p>Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards. Kāinga Ora accepts that it is appropriate to include rules in relation to flood hazards but seeks that the rules are not linked to static maps.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA. Notes</p>

				that there is no formal requirement for flooding overlay maps to be included within a district plan and also notes that the National Planning Standards 2016 – Mapping Standard Table 20 includes a number of specific overlay and other symbols, but none relate to flooding.
FS17.753	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS37.9	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	The whole of this submission should be disallowed.	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the Porirua Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk. Toka Tū Ake supports the use and expansion of regulatory flood-hazard maps based on up-to date modelling by Wellington Water.
FS74.108	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that all flood hazard maps are included in the District Plan, including the increased spatial extent proposed in Variation 1 and Proposed Plan Change 19.	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS. Retaining the hazard overlays in the plan provides a clear and transparent means for incorporating risk-based natural hazards planning into the provisions and ensures changes to these maps are subject to scrutiny through the publicly notified processes. It also gives certainty about the

				hazards affecting different areas in the district and where the hazard provisions apply. Removing flood hazard overlays from the District Plan does not fulfil best practice hazard planning or properly give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, Regional Hazard Management Strategy or national guidance.
FS99.118	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.70	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is disallowed, and that increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is retained in the plan change.	We oppose the removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around the areas that will be impacted by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards.
FS127.92	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.86	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Amend and make consequential changes to give effect to this submission [in relation to flood hazard overlays].	<p>Supports a risk-based approach to the management of natural hazards, however, opposes the inclusion of further flood hazard overlays within the maps as part of the District Plan.</p> <p>Including Flood Hazard overlays in the District Plan ignores the dynamic nature of flood hazards. Kāinga Ora accepts that it is appropriate to include rules in relation to flood hazards but seeks that the rules are not linked to static maps.</p> <p>The Auckland Unitary Plan (“AUP”) adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Council’s ‘Geo Maps’ website – a separate mapping viewer to the statutory maps. The advantage of this approach is the ability to operate a separate set of interactive maps which are continually subject to improvement and updates, outside of and without a reliance on the Schedule 1 process under the RMA. Notes that there is no formal requirement for flooding overlay maps to be included within a district plan and also notes that the National Planning Standards 2016 – Mapping Standard Table 20 includes a</p>



				number of specific overlay and other symbols, but none relate to flooding.
FS17.754	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.119	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.71	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request that removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is disallowed, and that increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays is retained in the plan change.	We oppose the removal of increased spatial extent of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around the areas that will be impacted by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards.
FS127.93	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.12-Active Street Frontage Mapping

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS28.2	Paremata Business Park	Amend	Include 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 ,27 and 29 Paremata Crescent into the Local Centre Zoning. This should also include extending the active frontage requirements. Or adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission, as necessary to give effect to this submission	These seven properties are bookended by the Local Centre Zone at each end. Including these as Local Centre Zone will increase the overall area of mixed use, create a cohesiveness to the streetscape, and will consequently improve the overall village character of the area. The sites are all along the northern side of Paremata Crescent.
FS17.608	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.17-High Density Residential Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.25	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Introduce zone [High Density Residential Zone] in walkable catchment around the train stations of Pukerua Bay and Paremata, which service commuter travel on the Kāpiti Line.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and</li> </ul>

				<p>considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.693	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.60	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.

FS32.74	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS47.22	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Oppose	<p>We note that the area included in the HDZ is twice the size originally proposed by Kāinga Ora last year - 800 metres from the train station as opposed to 400m from the station.</p> <p>This proposed HDZ will radically affect the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDZ) in Pukerua Bay surrounding the area identified to be a HDZ. The topography of the area will bring about significant shadowing of other residences if taller buildings, as proposed, are erected.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora wants to implement compact urban design. However, Pukerua Bay is not</p>	We seek that the whole of the submission seeking to introduce a HDZ in Pukerua Bay be disallowed.

		<p>part of the main urban area, and is essentially a rural village. It is being treated the same as the centre of Wellington city, with all its facilities and public transport options. The retail sector of Pukerua Bay consists of one store, a bookshop, beauty salon, and hairdressing salon. There are no cafes, restaurants, bars or entertainment venues. There is a primary school and kindergarten, but there is no secondary or tertiary education within 13 km.</p> <p>Employment opportunities are severely limited and the majority of residents in employment have to travel to other centres. There is no doctor or pharmacy in Pukerua Bay, the nearest of either being 6.5 km from the proposed zone. If one of the criteria necessary for intensive urban design is to have a 'walkable' catchment, Pukerua Bay does not meet that for many essential services.</p> <p>In respect to infrastructure services, while Pukerua Bay has the essential services of the three waters and electricity, it must be noted that residential intensification would put a strain on water supply and sewage disposal. In both those matters, Pukerua Bay is at the end of the line and could require costly upgrades to piping and pumping to meet the demand on water supply and sewage disposal. More intensive</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>design should be closer to the main facilities to reduce the cost of extending these pipelines to the edge of the city.</p> <p>The key principle the submitter, Kāinga Ora, applied in determining the HDZ is a 800 metre proximity to a railway station, which it designates as a Rapid Transit Stop. While the Greater Wellington Regional Council has embarked on increasing rail transport capacity and the frequency of services on the Kāpiti line, the resulting increase in capacity and frequency terminates at Plimmerton. Based on public transport availability, intensification in Porirua is better between Plimmerton and Tawa.</p> <p>We also think extending an HDZ to 800 metres from the train station would disadvantage people with limited mobility, including the elderly, disabled people, and people having to walk with small children to and from the train station from their homes.</p> <p>Pukerua Bay is also a vulnerable community in terms of climate change and bad weather. There are already numerous slips</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>in the area, on both private and public land, and a substantial part of the area KO has identified as a HDZ is increasingly slip prone and would be entirely unsuitable for taller buildings allowed in a HDZ. Our stormwater systems and power supply are vulnerable in the increasing number of storms as a result of climate change. Building more intensive housing at an isolated boundary of the city, far from many other services that are helpful in civil defence emergencies, would increase the pressure on welfare services during emergencies.</p> <p>Pukerua Bay Residents' Association is not opposed to intensification, and there are opportunities for it now. Some is already happening with infill housing of various types and sizes throughout the community, and this could be increased. We are not opposed to the MDZ introduced by the district plan change.</p> <p>The Submitter has failed to apply the purposes set out for a HDZ, which envisage an existing mesh of factors to support a high density of residences, and has instead settled on only one principle, the presence of a railway station. It's a one-size-fits-all</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>approach that assumes all the areas around every railway station are the same.</p> <p>We note that Kainga Ora is seeking an extension of the existing NCZ, presumably to provide services and facilities to support a larger population. But a larger community needs more than a few extra shops. It also needs parks and playgrounds, particularly for families that will not have them attached to their dwellings. The social and amenity services available in Pukerua Bay are not sufficient to support a substantially bigger population. The school is at capacity and could only take large numbers of extra students by putting buildings on the playground, which would reduce the amenity space in the community even more. There is no space to provide the facilities and public spaces needed to make a much more populous community into a pleasantly liveable area. It's an approach that fails to account for what limited facilities exist and what each area needs to support these developments.</p>	
FS74.134	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies



			manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.56	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.58	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS114.66	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We seek that this part of this submission that suggests introducing high density residential zones around walkable catchments is disallowed.	We oppose to rezoning areas around these suggested rapid transit stops as high-density residential zones because it is unclear how it has been decided that intensified development is appropriate in these areas. This submission also does not outline how the potential effects on the natural environment and water bodies will be managed in relation to the intensified development.
FS127.32	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.26	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Increase spatial extent of HRZ around an expanded Metropolitan Centre Zone.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for</li> </ul>

				<p>decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.694	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.61	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.75	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and

				ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS37.11	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.	The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&T research for Toka Tū Ake finds that liquefaction damage increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building (see Appendix 2). Toka Tū Ake therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for

				Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua.
FS74.135	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.55	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.59	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.204	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part and requests submission point be allowed in part, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.
FS127.33	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.48	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Expand the HRZ to apply to areas that are generally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10min/800m from the edge of MCZ</li> </ul>	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.716	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.141	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.34	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.81	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters

			<p>rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.55	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>
OS76.49	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Expand the HRZ to apply to areas that are generally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10min/800m from rapid transit stops (including train stations at Pukerua Bay and Paremata).</li> </ul>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as</li> </ul>



				<p>to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.717	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.142	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS75.33	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "

FS99.82	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.56	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.116	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Retain the areas applied with HRZ as notified, with the exception of specific changes sought in this submission and in Appendix 3 [to submission].	Generally supports the introduction and application of a High Density Residential Zone (HRZ), with the following exceptions.  Opportunities for further high density housing should be explored to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres and Rapid Transit Stops in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and

				<p>provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Does not support the introduction of the qualifying matter applying to steep south facing sites and associated height restrictions. Kāinga Ora seeks the removal of these areas from the mapped extent of the HRZ.</p> <p>Also seeks the rezoning of MUZ land to HRZ on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange to HRZ.</p>
FS17.784	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.33	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS74.149	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.

FS99.149	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS114.78	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	We request the part of the submission seeking to increase the residential height of Takapūwāhia and rezoning to High Density Residential Zone is disallowed.	We oppose increasing the residential height in Takapūwāhia. Enabling intensified development without appropriate controls puts pressure on our taiao and does not prioritise Te Mana o te Wai or climate resilience. This should be an area for Ngāti Toa to have tino rangatiratanga and decide how Ngāti Toa iwi would like development to occur on their whenua.
FS127.123	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.117	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Expand and seek for HRZ to apply to areas that are generally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 10min/800m walkable catchment from the expanded edge of MCZ and from rapid transit stops (including the train stations at Paremata and Pukerua Bay)</li> <li>ii. 10min/800m walkable catchment from the Town Centre Zone</li> <li>iii. Increase height limits to from 22m to 36m within 400m catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone as a Height Variation Control.</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunities for further high density housing should be explored to support the role and function of a wider range of Centres and Rapid Transit Stops in order to achieve well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. Consequential changes to maps and provisions are sought to give effect to these changes.</p> <p>Does not support the introduction of the qualifying matter applying to steep south facing sites and associated height restrictions. Seeks the removal of these areas from the mapped extent of the HRZ.</p> <p>Also seeks the rezoning of MUZ land to HRZ on the eastern side of the Mungavin interchange to HRZ.</p>
FS17.785	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS37.18	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Oppose	<p>This submission should be disallowed when regarding areas that are at risk from natural hazards, particularly liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.</p>	<p>The Metropolitan Centre Zone and parts of the surrounding High Density Residential Zone in Variation 1 to the Porirua Proposed District Plan are currently zoned in an area which is at high risk from liquefaction in an earthquake. Porirua is at risk from earthquake shaking from numerous faults in the Wellington Region. Liquefaction is likely to occur in Porirua during a Wellington Fault earthquake, which has an 11% chance of rupture in the next 100 years. T&amp;T research undertaken for Toka Tū Ake in 2022 finds that liquefaction damage increases with the height, size and irregularity of a building. Toka Tū Ake</p>

				therefore opposes increasing building height limits or residential density in areas of high liquefaction risk, as liquefaction or lateral spreading damage to foundations or lower levels of a building renders the entire building unfit for purpose and uninhabitable. MBIE planning for liquefaction guidance recommends restricting subdivision and development of vulnerable buildings in areas at high risk from liquefaction. See Appendix 1 for Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Potential map of Porirua overlaid with the proposed district plan zones
FS74.150	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and Te Mana o Te Wai, and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Greater Wellington support well-planned intensification, however, we do not support enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) and Te Mana o Te Wai.
FS99.150	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.124	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

## 31-Planning Maps > 31.18-Medium Density Residential Zone

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS76.163	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Retain the areas applied with MRZ across the Plan as notified, except where changes are sought from Kāinga Ora in this submission and in Appendix 3 [to submission] to upzone specific locations from MRZ to HRZ.	<p>Generally supports the MRZ mapping. In particular, supports the use and spatial application of the MRZ across the urban residential environment (except where changes are sought to upzone locations from MRZ to HRZ, as shown on the attached maps) [maps attached to submission].</p> <p>Generally supports the use and spatial extent of the Residential Intensification Precinct within the MRZ but seeks some small increases in some locations to ensure the coverage includes sites in the MRZ that are within a 400m catchment of the Local Centre.</p> <p>Supports the proposed rezoning of land between 16 Mungavin Street and Champion Street to MRZ.</p>

				Seeks an extension of the rezoning of land from Open Space to MRZ to also include land at 8-10 Champion Street, and the adjacent legal road.
FS17.831	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.36	KiwiRail	Support	Support in Part subject to appropriate setback and noise and vibration controls for sites near the rail corridor.	KiwiRail is not opposed to intensification near the rail corridor. To the extent any upzoning is proposed near the rail corridor then appropriate controls need to be included, consistent with KiwiRail's primary submission to both protect the safe and efficient operation of the rail network, and the health, safety and amenity of those establishing near the rail corridor.
FS99.196	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire



				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.170	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS81.8	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	Re-zone Pukerua Bay from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone, or provide justification as to why Medium Density is most appropriate for the area.	<p>Generally supports the extent of the Medium Density Zoning as shown on the planning maps.</p> <p>Notes that Pukerua Bay is located within a walkable catchment of a rapid transit stop but has been excluded from being a High Density Residential Zone. Notes Council's reasoning.</p> <p>The Medium Density Zoning of Pukerua Bay is not consistent with Policy 3 (c) of the NPS-UD which requires areas within a walkable catchment of a rapid transit stop to be zoned as high density. Seeks that sites located within a walkable catchment of the Pukerua Bay Station should be re-zoned from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. Assumes that Council may have justified the building density of Pukerua Bay in accordance with NPS-UD Policy 3 (d), but states that no justification has been provided within the s32 report.</p>

FS17.1042	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.394	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Allow	Kāinga Ora supports this submission, to the extent that it is consistent with Kāinga Ora's primary submission

## 32-General > 32.1-General

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS3.2	Paul Winter	Not Stated	PCC to increase the city's overall housing intensification while still maintaining less intense and high quality suburbs like Aotea.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts need for some change but has concerns about impacts on character and amenity.</li> <li>• With Council having been directed to do this, it does not provide enough allowance for what is appropriate to a local community. Provides example of General Residential Zone substituted with Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>• Need to balance housing intensification with other objectives in local plans (such as maintaining or enhancing the level of community well being, quality urban design and adequate infrastructure).</li> <li>• How new subdivisions, e.g. the proposed development of the Northern Corridor, should only be granted resource consent under proposed guidelines for MRZ with existing subdivision remaining under GRZ guidelines. Similarly, development of a Master Plan Regeneration Process, as</li> </ul>

				<p>proposed for Eastern Porirua can deliver increased housing intensification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having lived in Aotea is supportive of the developer following guidelines in the Porirua Operative District Plan, with regards to amenity and character. Refers to a recent home purchase in Aotea with a quality of outlook and is concerned investment could be destroyed (from having 3-storey houses and up to 3 dwellings on each lot).</li> <li>• Refers to residential and commercial development/character in Aotea including how 1 and 2 storey homes in Aotea maximise access to views and light shafts. Also how a recent townhouse development does not dominate/adversely or impact amenities.</li> <li>• Pressure on infrastructure.</li> <li>• Impact on property values.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.7	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS120.2	Baswa Surukanti	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and</li> <li>• density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and</li> <li>• density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>
OS3.3	Paul Winter	Support	Support Medium Residential Zone for any Master Plan regeneration areas like that proposed for Eastern Porirua.	Comments/concerns raised in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts need for some change but has concerns about impacts on character and amenity.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With Council having been directed to do this, it does not provide enough allowance for what is appropriate to a local community. Provides example of General Residential Zone substituted with Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>• Need to balance housing intensification with other objectives in local plans (such as maintaining or enhancing the level of community well being, quality urban design and adequate infrastructure).</li> <li>• How new subdivisions, e.g. the proposed development of the Northern Corridor, should only be granted resource consent under proposed guidelines for MRZ with existing subdivision remaining under GRZ guidelines. Similarly, development of a Master Plan Regeneration Process, as proposed for Eastern Porirua can deliver increased housing intensification.</li> <li>• Having lived in Aotea is supportive of the developer following guidelines in the Porirua Operative District Plan, with regards to amenity and character. Refers to a recent home purchase in Aotea with a</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>quality of outlook and is concerned investment could be destroyed (from having 3-storey houses and up to 3 dwellings on each lot).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refers to residential and commercial development/character in Aotea including how 1 and 2 storey homes in Aotea maximise access to views and light shafts. Also how a recent townhouse development does not dominate/adversely or impact amenities.</li> <li>• Pressure on infrastructure.</li> <li>• Impact on property values.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.8	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS3.4	Paul Winter	Support	Support for Medium Residential Zone for new subdivisions like the Northern Corridor.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts need for some change but has concerns about impacts on character and amenity.</li> <li>• With Council having been directed to do this, it does not provide enough allowance for what is appropriate to a local community. Provides example of General Residential Zone</li> </ul>

				<p>substituted with Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to balance housing intensification with other objectives in local plans (such as maintaining or enhancing the level of community well being, quality urban design and adequate infrastructure).</li> <li>• How new subdivisions, e.g. the proposed development of the Northern Corridor, should only be granted resource consent under proposed guidelines for MRZ with existing subdivision remaining under GRZ guidelines. Similarly, development of a Master Plan Regeneration Process, as proposed for Eastern Porirua can deliver increased housing intensification.</li> <li>• Having lived in Aotea is supportive of the developer following guidelines in the Porirua Operative District Plan, with regards to amenity and character. Refers to a recent home purchase in Aotea with a quality of outlook and is concerned investment could be destroyed (from having 3-storey houses and up to 3 dwellings on each lot).</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refers to residential and commercial development/character in Aotea including how 1 and 2 storey homes in Aotea maximise access to views and light shafts. Also how a recent townhouse development does not dominate/adversely or impact amenities.</li> <li>• Pressure on infrastructure.</li> <li>• Impact on property values.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.9	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS3.5	Paul Winter	Oppose	Opposes Medium Residential Zone for existing GRZ suburbs.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts need for some change but has concerns about impacts on character and amenity.</li> <li>• With Council having been directed to do this, it does not provide enough allowance for what is appropriate to a local community. Provides example of General Residential Zone substituted with Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>• Need to balance housing intensification with other objectives in local plans (such as</li> </ul>

				<p>maintaining or enhancing the level of community well being, quality urban design and adequate infrastructure).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How new subdivisions, e.g. the proposed development of the Northern Corridor, should only be granted resource consent under proposed guidelines for MRZ with existing subdivision remaining under GRZ guidelines. Similarly, development of a Master Plan Regeneration Process, as proposed for Eastern Porirua can deliver increased housing intensification.</li> <li>• Having lived in Aotea is supportive of the developer following guidelines in the Porirua Operative District Plan, with regards to amenity and character. Refers to a recent home purchase in Aotea with a quality of outlook and is concerned investment could be destroyed (from having 3-storey houses and up to 3 dwellings on each lot).</li> <li>• Refers to residential and commercial development/character in Aotea including how 1 and 2 storey homes in Aotea maximise access to views and light shafts. Also</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>how a recent townhouse development does not dominate/adversely or impact amenities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure on infrastructure.</li> <li>• Impact on property values.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.10	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS120.3	Baswa Surukanti	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and</li> <li>• density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> </ul>	<p>New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and</p> <p>density of housing.</p> <p>Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</p> <p>access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</p> <p>Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</p> <p>Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>	<p>The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</p> <p>porirua city centre</p> <p>Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</p> <p>Eases housing pressure.</p>
OS5.1	Alwyn (Taffy) Parry	Not Stated	<p>In relation to 139 Airlie Road, Plimmerton, seeks a change to the district plan to allow for subdivision of the section and to build a smaller home.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]</p>	<p>Provides an introduction to previous work undertaken at the property including in the garden and outlines a number of comments in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased planting undertaken at the property and there is increased birdlife and wildlife at the property.</li> <li>• Desire to subdivide and build a smaller home as current home is too large to maintain.</li> <li>• Presence of wildings and pines on a triangle of land and how access would not create problems for road users.</li> <li>• Changing designation of property when it was once considered as a continuation of urban Airlie Road.</li> <li>• Commercial viability and building costs.</li> <li>• Subdivision as a chance to enhance/beautify the area and</li> </ul>

				<p>an opportunity for wildlife to prosper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subdivision would not intrude physically onto the area Nor West now dedicated to the Manuka/Kanuka forest or the stream.</li> <li>• Previous discussions with PCC about subdivision.</li> <li>• Costs of servicing.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>
FS17.59 7	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS7.1	Rob Bell	Oppose	Delete [housing intensification]	Strongly oppose any change to existing heights of existing residential areas. If the Council deems three storey properties are the way to go then do it for new subdivisions only. At least the buyers of properties would know what they are getting.
FS17.19	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS16.3	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	The densification developer must purchase immediately adjacent (in front, beside and behind) properties, if requested by those owners, before starting any work, at agreed valuation, or failing agreement, the average of three registered valuations, two valuers appointed by the seller, and one by the	[No specific reasons given]

			developer. All PCC consents will be subject to this process having been concluded, with owners having received full payment. No full settlement – no consent.	
OS16.5	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	Elected PCC officials and employed PCC staff, must declare (and publish) any potential and actual conflicts of interest, before consents or District Plan changes are considered. PCC, elected PCC officials and PCC staff will have unlimited liability for any harm as a result of directly or indirectly breaching this requirement.	[No specific reason given]
FS99.20	Alan Collett	Support	Part of the submission in regards to declaration of conflicts of interest by elected officials of the PCC.	Elected PCC officials and employed PCC staff, must declare (and publish) any potential and actual conflicts of interest before consents or District Plan changes are considered.  Incumbent Mayor has had a previous professional relationship with one of the proposed developers.
OS16.6	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	A densified property on a street, will trigger a vehicle speed reduction to 30kmph for the entire street, effective from the consent being granted.	[No specific reasons given]
OS16.8	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	A one storey building must be at least one metre from all the boundaries. A two storey building must be at least two metres from all the boundaries. A three storey building must be at least three metres from all the boundaries. And so on. Different rules to apply within the CBD, and / or between commercial buildings.	[No specific reasons given]

OS16.9	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	PCC liable to compensate for 25 years from the date of consent or occupancy, whichever is later, for all new structures, and extensions to existing structures (including site works), deemed to have harmed or contributed to harm, of surrounding land and buildings, in particular land slippage / movement. Compensation to be paid to said owners at agreed valuation, or failing agreement, the average of three registered valuations, two valuers appointed by the owner, and one by PCC.	[No specific reasons given]
OS19.1	Tim Goode	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission].	Wishes to convey is that the submitter has few issues with the proposals for the High Density zones or the Intensification precincts. Eastern Porirua is left to those who it affects.
FS17.598	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS27.4	Pukerua Holdings Limited	Support	Retain all provisions of the notified plan change and adopt the plan change accordingly.	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.606	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS22.5	On Behalf of landowner SS Pointon	Support	Allow the whole submission	Support the submission by Pukerua Holdings Ltd (submitter 27) for the creation of the NGA. The support of the submitter is that it would be successful enable our submission to extend to

				extend the NGA area to include our land achievable.
OS28.5	Paremata Business Park	Amend	Adopt any other such relief, including additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission, as necessary to give effect to this submission.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.61 1	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS32.1	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	<p>Ensuring that Variation 1 adopts controls and limits to development in such a way that any resulting development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids the incursion of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into the water bodies and Te Awarua-o-Porirua; and that</li> <li>• The ecological integrity and functioning of Te Awarua-o-Porirua is at least preserved and preferably enhanced.</li> </ul>	<p>To better protect the harbour and catchment integrity and ecology.</p> <p>Amendments designed to control and limit run off and its adverse effects, specifically including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies</li> <li>• The risks of excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</li> <li>• The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</li> </ul> <p>The Government's requirements for Porirua City to apply the provisions in this amendment will inevitably risk</p>



				<p>undesirable patchwork development that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead to an increase in sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies and then Te Awarua o Porirua;</li> <li>• Have adverse consequences on the city's infrastructure and especially stormwater, sewerage, roading and transport systems; and</li> <li>• Lead to progressive deterioration in the level and quality of the built environment and the level and quality of amenity that it supports.</li> </ul>
FS17.55	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.4 52	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS32.2	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	The requirement to have no mandated off-street parking is totally inappropriate for the Porirua urban area. It has developed as a low density, car-based environment. Walking and cycling provide limited options to access key services and amenities, and public transport services are limited. Any change to have a non-car based urban environment will take decades to achieve. The provisions that the city is

				now forced to apply will not only result in streets being progressively congested but will increase vehicle-based contaminants (such as oil, grease, zinc and accumulated dirt), entering water bodies and Te Awarua-o-Porirua.
FS17.56	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.4 53	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS36.4	Charmaine Thomson	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>How specifically might PCC resource managed retreat due to climate risks, and factor in insurances and social/economic cohesion?</p> <p>It could be considered disingenuous to require people to cross -reference 94+ pages in the two PDP evaluation reports against Section 32 of the RMA reports, then unpack all the policies alongside the technical GIS property information and navigate what the critical points are e.g. if you live in X rohe region you may need to relocate inland within the next Y years because of flood risks/increasing king tides...and this is how specifically PCC will support and resource relocations - so people are not further disadvantaged, especially older and disabled people - alternately, this is how PCC plans to resource coastal buffer zones to sustain</p>

				<p>the environment as per kaitiakitanga responsibilities.</p> <p>Not everyone in paid and unpaid work has the privilege of time and/or digital equity to access the 'friend of the submitter' online option.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
OS36.5	Charmaine Thomson	Not Stated	Quality assurance of the tender process and ethical tika environmental considerations e.g., resourcing and assuring replanting where developers might unintentionally damage land, water tables etc.	<p>Query the 'affordability' price points for the 3-storey houses against the escalating 7.65% rates increases and 7.3% inflation, and who will benefit most from the proposed approach?</p> <p>Any approved developers must deliver housing at price points less than inflation, CPI, and average household expenditures. Otherwise, housing density is only being offered to high income earners and potentially pushes community into insecure and unhealthy housing options.</p> <p>The RMA does have legislative requirements, and sometimes developers do not abide by all the statutory requirements before moving on to their next project e.g., the damage sustained by the quarry in Hongoeka Bay.</p>
OS38.2	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Easier consenting and incentives for accessible and eco-friendly developments.	The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential

				<p>zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.3	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Providing incentives for lifts in multi-storey developments	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-</p>

				<p>hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.4	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Working with central government to improve accessibility and building performance requirements in the Building Code.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our</p>

				<p>environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.
OS38.5	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Prioritising emissions reduction, better quality of life, and community cohesion and resilience.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs</p>



				<p>look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.7	Amos Mann	Not Stated	<p>Multifunctional community spaces within centres as Climate Action Hubs to support the circular economy, provide space for innovation, education and behaviour change and create a tangible vision of a low carbon future.</p>	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community</p>

				<p>members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.8	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Circular economy principles being integrated into the district plan so that waste is minimised and designed out of construction projects, and that resource recovery	The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential

			<p>infrastructure is put in place to manage any remaining waste.</p>	<p>zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.11	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Centering Tangata Whenua and placing Te Tiriti at the core of planning.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-</p>

				<p>hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.22	Amos Mann	Not Stated	The District Plan must support a diverse range of housing alternatives more fully with specific planning that incentivises and attracts co-housing, tiny-housing, and Papakāinga projects.	The District Plan has a tremendous causal effect on housing affordability and housing/transport economics. Increasingly, in large part to combat housing/transport affordability barriers, we are seeing larger number of people turn to alternative housing solutions that include co-housing, tiny-housing, long-term flatting and group-purchasing, and Papakāinga.

				<p>These alternatives are not only excellent viable solutions to housing affordability barriers, but also, if well planned for by council, are solutions to reducing the climate change and environmental impacts of single family traditional housing because these alternatives can use much less land per occupant and less building materials per occupant.</p> <p>In addition, well-planned co-living is a viable solution for increasing social-cohesion, with residences providing multi-generational support networks for each other in good times, and providing vital care at times of natural disaster and emergency.</p> <p>Tiny-housing also has a resiliency advantage over single dwelling permanent housing, in that a tiny-housing community can relocate relatively easily as climate change impacts increase.</p>
OS38.24	Amos Mann	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Support combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions, that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre expertise and economies of scale.
OS41.1	Helga Sheppard	Oppose	<p>Strongly opposes District Plan Change 1 and Variation 1.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>Raises comments/concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three - six storey dwellings being out of character with area.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appears to be no mention of recourse for land owners if natural enjoyment of properties is impacted.</li> <li>• Could not establish in section 32 report if there were environmental assessments for Titahi Bay of the impact from high density dwellings on affected areas. Also whether any current assessments were peer-reviewed to confirm findings.</li> <li>• Has restored garden so it is organic, and resulting in increased birdlife.</li> <li>• Loss of sunlight if third-storey dwellings erected on surrounding properties (loss of all sunlight from north). This would result in having to remove trees, which would impact on bird and insect life, drainage issues, and affect the character of their property including privacy.</li> <li>• Infrastructure issues: from high-density dwellings; previous discharges into Titahi Bay, whether there has been an assessment/plan to consider impacts of proposed plan change and variation on existing infrastructure, concerns with</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>rates, and exacerbating an existing bad situation.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.94	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS44.2	Ian McKeown	Amend	<p>May wish to defer any amendment to the Proposed District Plan until the next Long Term Plan in July 2024 is tabled and all relevant issues can be dealt with and considered as a whole rather than a piece meal approach as per the current pathway.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]</p>	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would the Council will respond to capacity issues with higher density and medium density housing.</li> <li>• Current infrastructure cannot support current housing.</li> <li>• Flood prone areas and recent flooding events.</li> <li>• Discussions with PCC and with Wellington Water regarding flooding.</li> <li>• Acheron Road and parts of Mana Esplanade marked for higher density housing and medium density housing - how will this cope with severe weather storms, flooding and resultant damage.</li> <li>• Council responses to other issues (storm water drain cover matter and complaints about rubbish collection).</li> </ul>



				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]
FS17.99	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS47.21	Pukerua Bay Residents Association	Not Stated	PCC to allocate dedicated resources to monitoring and evaluating the works to ensure compliance with the DP, resource consents and the provision of medium density housing with a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures envisaged in the DP.	Monitoring and evaluation. These two developments will be almost as big as Plimmerton Farm. The issue of regulatory bodies, in particular PCC and Greater Wellington, being able to properly monitor compliance with resource consents and the DP was extensively litigated during the Plimmerton Farm DP and resource consent stages. PCC has allocated dedicated staff resources to these tasks. Given the scale of the two developments included in the Pukerua Bay Structure Plan and the land already zoned residential, they need the same amount of PCC staff resources dedicated to monitoring compliance with the DP variation, the Structure Plan and any resource consents issued for the work.
FS17.120	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS49.1	Susan Price	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Submitter has attempted to view and understand the proposed changes. Despite having some familiarity with this kind of material found it hard to understand. What is not made clear is whether a changed designation leads to out and out ability to proceed without restriction. One assumes not but this is

			<p>not clear. Without more this makes it difficult to assess the true impact. For example, to permit a 6 story building near the Plimmerton station seems completely out of character but perhaps this would never be approved for that reason. However, if these changes do mean developers can move in and change that character then this seems wrong...the designations that permit 6 story buildings should instead be medium density ie 3 story maximum and the areas designated 3 story not changed at all.</p> <p>Plimmerton - sea side is a small community with limited infrastructure particularly as regards storm water - there are also issues with the sea walls - moving more people into this confined area with threats of climate change seems shortsighted. These concerns also extend to the proposed extensive building at Plimmerton Farm - with significant flooding already experienced around the Palmers area and state highway 59 one wonders if adequate precautions have been put upon the developers to address these issues - where will the stormwater go from thousands of new homes? Councils are encouraged to think ahead - this does not seem to have happened as regards the considerable impact on our 3 waters let</p>
--	--	--	---

				alone the impact on schools, roads and other community services.
OS53.1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Amend	<p>The amendments sought through the submission are confined in nature and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendment to the explanatory text with the RESZ chapter</li> <li>• Amendment to RESZ-P1</li> <li>• Inclusion of an advisory note to MRZ-R1</li> <li>• Inclusion of a definition of 'qualifying matter area'; and</li> <li>• Inclusion of the National Grid Subdivision Corridor rule in the IPI.</li> </ul>	<p>Largely supports the proposed IPI. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The identification of the National Grid within the IPI as a qualifying matter, and</li> <li>• Inclusion of the PDP National Grid Corridor provisions within the IPI and ISPP process.</li> </ul>
FS17.61 2	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS53.3	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	All submission points and hearing evidence of Transpower to the PDP stand. These include the objectives, policies and rules relating to the National Grid.
FS17.61 4	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS56.1	John Cody	Support	<p>Seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and rules that enable the region and neighbourhoods to achieve the public objectives. For</li> </ul>	Supports Objective 1 Resource Management (Enabling Housing and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 s.6 , but notes that the emphasis on 'their' makes the objective too narrow insofar

			<p>example moving to harmonise active provisions across the region, or at least within the metropolitan area, such as inclusionary zones in the vicinity of public transport hubs and minimum density requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Panel could also focus the application of policies and rules by providing direction on the content required in the next HBA so the report relates directly to the Objectives of the Variation and NPS-UD 3.23(2).</li> </ul>	<p>as it ignores the wider implications of local decisions.</p> <p>The Plan takes a passive permissive approach to suburban regeneration.</p> <p>The scale of the proposal is justified if the intention is to promote greater population density to address fundamental problems related to, for example, energy efficiency, resilient infrastructure, demographic changes, environmental degradation, provision of 'decent homes' for all, and movement towards international norms.</p> <p>The public objectives can be ignored or undermined if TLAs take inconsistent approaches to 'market' dynamics.</p>
FS17.64 1	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS56.4	John Cody	Support	Seeks to have the work [initiated by McIndoe URBAN (2020) 'Indicators of Health & Wellbeing '] completed in a form that can be used to assess contributions to the Objectives of the Variation having regard to the scope of related projects e.g. the Wellington Region Genuine Progress Index.	<p>Supports the direction initiated by McIndoe URBAN (2020) 'Indicators of Health &amp; Wellbeing . . . '.</p> <p>There is very little scope in the proposed Plan for the City Council to fulfill its statutory purposes (LGA s.10). Aligning with Kāinga Ora or TROTR is constructive but not, as yet, sufficiently productive.</p>

				The Council cannot divest itself of responsibility to respond to local themes e.g. the agenda and leading contributions to the most recent Plimmerton Residents' Association AGM.
FS17.64 4	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS56.6	John Cody	Not Stated	Include a policy that requires the City Council to respond to residents of communities or neighbourhoods willing to consider local options for meeting the objectives of the Variation.	Supports the direction initiated by McIndoe URBAN (2020) 'Indicators of Health & Wellbeing . . .'.  There is very little scope in the proposed Plan for the City Council to fulfill its statutory purposes (LGA s.10). Aligning with Kāinga Ora or TROTR is constructive but not, as yet, sufficiently productive.  The Council cannot divest itself of responsibility to respond to local themes e.g. the agenda and leading contributions to the most recent Plimmerton Residents' Association AGM.
FS17.64 6	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS57.1	He Ara Pukerua	Not Stated	The concrete horse trough, near to Highway 59, used by the Mounted Home Guard during WW2 should also be protected.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]

OS57.2	He Ara Pukerua	Not Stated	<p>The trench and earthworks at 310 State Highway 59, Part Haukopua East Block should be protected within an area at least five metres from any part of the feature and fenced when any building commences nearby.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments].</p>	<p>310 State Highway 59, Pukerua Bay, Part Haukopua East Block includes an intact and significant WW2 trench located at grid reference E1758545 / N5453502. This is one of five archaeological sites (the others are R26/803, R26/804, R26/805 and R26/806) in, or very close to, the Northern Growth Area covered by Variation 1.</p> <p>The trench is on a ridge top and consists of 12 zigs and zags each about 5 metres long.</p> <p>There is a pit at the western end and at the eastern end are three large indentations all connected to one another and the trench system.</p> <p>It was constructed early in 1942 in preparation for the expected Japanese invasion.</p> <p>It was used by the Mounted Home Guard possibly from the Hutt. This site is recorded as R26/820 with the New Zealand Archaeological Association.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>
--------	----------------	------------	--	---

OS58.1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Due to operational and training requirements, FENZ has an interest in the land use provisions of the Proposed District Plan to ensure that, where necessary, appropriate consideration is given to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements, particularly in relation to housing development (e.g. to ensure adequate consideration is given to risk reduction and emergency response requirements) and fire station development (e.g. to ensure the development of new fire station facilities are appropriately enabled, in the context of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources).</p> <p>To meet its statutory responsibilities, FENZ requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies;</li> <li>▪ the ability to undertake training activities for the firefighters within the region; and</li> <li>▪ adequate access and water supply for new developments and subdivisions to ensure that FENZ can effectively and</li> </ul>
--------	--------------------------------	------------	---	--

				<p>efficiently respond to emergencies.</p> <p>There are three fire stations within the Porirua District. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p> <p>The effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of a number of activities that may be anticipated in urban or peri-environments.</p> <p>In terms of height requirements, fire stations will generally be single storied buildings of approximately 8 to 9 metres in height. Hose drying towers may also be required in some cases, which can be around 12 to 15 metres in height.</p> <p>Setback distances from road frontages are also required to accommodate the stopping of appliances outside the appliance bays, but off the road reserve area.</p> <p>Vehicle movements to and from fire station sites differ depending on whether a fire station accommodates volunteer or career firefighters, on the number of emergencies, and are primarily related to</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>fire appliances movements and firefighter private vehicles.</p> <p>Noise will also be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, FENZ has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), with the exclusion of noise created by emergency sirens.</p>
FS17.13 4	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	The provision of adequate firefighting water supply access to that supply is critical. It is important to FENZ that any new dwelling or land use that does not have access to a reticulated water supply has access to an adequate firefighting water supply of some kind. This essential emergency supply will provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the wider community, and therefore

				<p>achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).</p> <p>The New Zealand Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ/PAS 4509:2008 (Code of Practice) is a non-mandatory New Zealand Standard which sets out the requirements for firefighting water and access. The Code of Practice enables a consistent approach throughout New Zealand and allows FENZ to respond effectively and efficiently to a fire emergency. The Code of Practice provides techniques to define a sufficient firefighting water supply that may vary according to the circumstances and is based on an assessment of the minimum water supply needed to fight a fire and to limit fire spread. Volumes required vary according to each different building's fire hazards.</p> <p>The operative District Plan does not make reference to the Code of Practice 4509:2008, however, it contains multiple provisions relating to the operational requirements of firefighters. FENZ acknowledges these provisions in the operative district plan and seeks to provide guidance to NPDC as to how best to improve the provisions of the district plan with respect to providing firefighting water supply and access to better enable</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>FENZ to meet its statutory responsibilities.</p> <p>Adequate access to both the source of a fire and a firefighting water supply is also essential to the efficient operation of FENZ. The requirements for firefighting access are set out in the Code of Practice and further detailed in FENZ's 'Emergency Vehicle Access Guidelines' (May 2015). A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is four metres in width and four metres in height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 1 in 5 (and accompanying transition ramps).</p>
FS17.13 5	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Seeks that new fire stations are provided for in all zones permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activities with permitted standards appropriately recognising emergency services, such as through building height and access provisions which accommodate the requirements of fire stations.	<p>New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change.</p> <p>FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. Therefore considers that provisions within the District Plan are the best way</p>

				<p>to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district.</p> <p>A new fire station could conceivably be required in any of the urban zones within the district.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.13 6	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS64.8	Brian Warburton	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	In April 2022 the Council undertook community engagement about potential amendments to the proposed District Plan (Variation 1) and in response to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. A feedback period up till 6 May 2022 was indicated. There is no record on the Council's website of the Council agreeing to officer(s) recommendation to release a draft variation to the community for consultation and feedback, and nor is there any record of the Council agreeing to the scope of such a variation. By all accounts the decision to consult on a draft of Variation 1, and the substance of the draft, belongs to council officers and not to the councillors.

				<p>Council endorsement – Proposed Variation 1 for Notification. On 23 June 2022 the Council adopted a recommendation from council officers that a IPI (Intensification Planning Instrument) be notified. The council officers’ recommendation report about proposed Variation 1 to the PDP makes no reference to the provisions of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 relating to Qualifying Matters. Council adopted that recommendation and the IPI was notified in the middle of August 2022 with a closing date for submissions of 12 September 2022. By all accounts the decision by Council to notify Variation 1 was made in the absence of any advice from council officers about, and correspondingly no understanding by councillors of, the concept of ‘qualifying matters’, nor how the application of the concept of qualifying matters may result in better resource management outcomes. The audio-visual recording is accessible here:  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vpqu7HP1PAU&amp;list=PLCOG4gbk0tPfy1qd1PdNRikIUSkQzKh&amp;index=13&amp;t=1544s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vpqu7HP1PAU&amp;list=PLCOG4gbk0tPfy1qd1PdNRikIUSkQzKh&amp;index=13&amp;t=1544s</a></p> <p>A review of this recording shows a significant degree of uncertainty amongst the Councillors and also a degree of misleading information (in terms of what</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>flexibility within the Variation 1 provisions are possible) provided to them by the Mayor, the committee chair and by council officers.</p> <p>I have watched the recording of the council meeting and I've not seen any evidence of the 'Qualifying Matters' concept being explained to councillors.</p> <p>Council staff gave advice to the Council (in response to questions from councillors about their scope) used expressions like this: • "the intent to go higher and more dense we don't have" • "we don't have the ability to challenge that" • "where it is not logical for natural hazard reasons and things like that is where we have room to move" • "this is the reality of this Variation change as you say from the Government which has just done a blanket, a blanket change across the whole country" • "It is what it is unfortunately" • "It doesn't have nuance. It doesn't have bespoke in it."</p> <p>PCC Mayor Baker said this: • "we're following what the government has to do". • "there's lots of people out there who are nervous about high risers coming to something near them but basically we're just doing what we have to do."</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Councillor Leggett (committee chair) said this: • “so just going through the process”  • ‘so we’re really going through a process which is all about form and the actual impact that anyone can have ... is actually minimal”</p> <p>“Room to move” appears to be the extent of the council officers’ consideration of the provisions of the Amendment Act relating to Qualifying Matters and their corresponding advice to councillors.</p> <p>I think that the Council’s decision to notify Variation 1 in its current form was made in a ‘policy vacuum’. Therefore, the content of proposed Variation 1 has not been suitably ratified by Council, and the RMA process currently underway is invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.27 4	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS67.1	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Not Stated	Ryman seeks the relief sought by the RVA in its submission on Variation 1 and PC19.	Adopts the RVA’s submission on Variation 1 and PC19.

				Emphasises that Variation 1 and PC19 will have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for Porirua’s growing ageing population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region.
FS17.64 7	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS68.1	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Not Stated	<p>Ensure that Variation 1 adopts controls and limits to development in such a way that any resulting development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids the incursion of sediment, contaminants and nutrients into the catchments, water bodies and sensitive wetlands flowing into Te Awarua-o-Porirua; and</li> <li>• The ecological integrity and functioning of these contributing water bodies and that of Te Awarua-o-Porirua are at least preserved and preferably enhanced by these measures.</li> </ul>	<p>Supports amendments to better protect the harbour and catchment integrity and ecology. These proposals are designed to control and limit run off and its adverse effects, specifically including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effects of sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies;</li> <li>• The risks of excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems, and</li> <li>• The adverse and potentially irreversible effects on the harbour and coastal environment from sediment, contaminants and nutrients.</li> </ul> <p>Shares the views of PHACCT and of GOPI in their assertion that the Government’s requirements for Porirua City to apply the provisions in this amendment will</p>



				<p>inevitably risk ‘undesirable patchwork development’, that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead to an increase in sediment, contaminants and nutrients entering water bodies and then Te Awarua-o-Porirua;</li> <li>• Have adverse consequences on the city’s infrastructure and especially stormwater &amp; sewerage; and</li> <li>• Lead to progressive deterioration in the level and quality of the built environment and the level and quality of amenity that it supports.</li> </ul>
FS17.28 2	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.4 79	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS71.2	Silverwood Corporation Limited	Support	Retain	<p>Support in part, insofar that the submitter generally supports the policy intent, outcomes and provision of housing goals of Variation 1 as they are aligned with the intent of the submitters submission to rezone the Silverwood and Landcorp sites.</p> <p>The development capacity goals of Variation 1 are aligned with the intent and intended outcomes of the Submitters original PDP submission to rezone the</p>

				Silverwood and Landcorp sites. Supports the rezoning of greenfield land (both FUZ land as well as other appropriate land) to ensure that Council is providing sufficient housing capacity to give effect to the NPS-UD including Policy 2. Under Policy 2, Council must provide 'at least' sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and for business land over the short term, medium term, and long term. To do this, Council has proposed to rezone a part of the Northern Growth Area (defined as 'Deferred Land (rural)' in the NGA Structure Plan 2014) that is already identified as FUZ as well as additional land that is currently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone.
FS17.650	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS71.3	Silverwood Corporation Limited	Amend	Amend to include the Silverwood/Landcorp Site identified in submission 172 and further submission 34 ("the Site") so that: (i) A Structure Plan is incorporated in the District Plan for the Site; and/or (ii) The site is live-zoned to Medium Density Residential Zone or any other appropriate zone/s informed by the structure plan; and/or (iii) A Silverwood/Landcorp Development Area chapter is incorporated into the District Plan that includes site	A comprehensive submission was presented by the submitter to the Proposed District Plan. That submission seeks a Future Urban Zone over the Site. The submission was supported by thorough expert assessments including on ecology, landscape and urban design, traffic, engineering and infrastructure, economics and planning. A draft Structure Plan was included with the submission and presented in evidence.

		<p>-specific provisions that seek to manage subdivision, use and development of the site in line with identified opportunities and constraints of the Site for residential purposes; and/or</p> <p>(iv) RETAIN existing overlay controls that seek to manage activities in specific areas of the Site (including any landscape protection areas, SNA's, national grid and natural hazard overlay areas or AMEND with any specific modifications that are most appropriate to address the particular circumstances of the Site; and</p> <p>(v) Make any other such modifications that are necessary to implement points (i) – (iv)</p>	<p>The submission was supported by Ngāti Toa.</p> <p>Some refinement of the Structure Plan is required for it to support a live zone, which includes identification of sensitive parts of the Site, and this may include the identification of landscape and Open Space areas (indicative or otherwise). Appropriate residential zonings, including the possibility of bespoke Development Area specific provisions that seek to implement the Structure Plan.</p> <p>In any event, there is considerable understanding of the constraints and opportunities for urban and residential development on the Site, whilst at the same time recognizing its sensitivities.</p> <p>PV1 seeks to rezone the Northern Growth Area from Future Urban Zone and approximately 80ha of Rural-Lifestyle Zone to a live residential zone. Rezoning of several other sites in Porirua to residential zones and up-zoning of existing residential land is also proposed.</p> <p>It is consistent with the intent and justification for PV1, for the Site now to have a Structure Plan incorporated and live zoning provisions provided that reflect the Draft Structure Plan and significant body of assessment already undertaken and the further refinement work</p>
--	--	---	---

				recommended and undertaken by the project team experts. This would be an appropriate outcome and an efficient use of resources.
FS17.65 1	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS72.12	KiwiRail	Amend	All related and consequential amendments as required to achieve the relief sought above.	The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will: (a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district; (d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure; (e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.
FS17.30 9	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS73.4	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Ensure that these effects [of electromagnetic radiation] are understood and recognised through the Proposed Variation	<p>The effects of electromagnetic radiation (EMR) from the RNZ's transmitter masts are not well understood across New Zealand. Radiation from the masts can induce dangerous EMR levels into nearby tall metallic objects through EMR coupling.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.313	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.5	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4</p>

				and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.330	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.34	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further

				issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS74.6	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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) and (g)).	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The</p>

				strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.33 1	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.35	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS74.7	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend or include new controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules and include appropriate policy direction to	Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM



			<p>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>and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

FS17.33 2	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.36	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
FS59.11	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Oppose	Disallow the submission points where they result in an unknown outcome for the Northern Growth Area.	The planning provisions in the PDP must be certain and provide for the objectives in the Plan. The submission points do not provide certainty and do not promote integrated management.
OS74.10	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a policy and amend relevant rules to include triggers for consent and matters of control or discretion which requires the application of water sensitive urban design principles, including sustainable stormwater design to minimises impacts on the natural	Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The

			<p>environment 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>relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
FS17.33 5	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS32.39	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
FS59.13	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Oppose	Disallow the submission points where they result in an unknown outcome for the Northern Growth Area.	The planning provisions in the PDP must be certain and provide for the objectives in the Plan. The submission points do not provide certainty and do not promote integrated management.
FS118.1 35	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as the relief sought is not clear, and has the potential to slow down the provision of housing to respond to demand, contrary to the intent of the NPSUD.
OS74.11	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Retain policies and rules and/or rule requirements that restrict the use of copper/zinc building materials and the	Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM

			<p>extent of impervious surfaces i.e 50% (required by MDRS) (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(i)).</p>	<p>and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

FS17.33 6	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.40	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS74.12	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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)).	Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.  Amendments may be required across the

				<p>plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
FS17.33 7	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.41	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of

			<p>requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.</p>	<p>Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua’s built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW’s position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA</p>
OS74.16	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend the matters of control or discretion in earthworks provisions regarding the potential for adverse effects on water quality of any waterbody, wahi tapu, wahi taonga and habitat of any significant indigenous species</p>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section</p>



				80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.34 1	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.45	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable

				slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS74.28	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Add a 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>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>
FS17.35 3	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.39	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Submitter also seeks for the REE (Resilience, Efficiency and Energy) objectives to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 climate change objectives, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The

				<p>relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy CC.8.</p> <p>Prioritising greenhouse gas emissions reduction over offsetting – district and regional In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d).</p>
FS17.36 4	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.40	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a policy on directing matters to consider when determining the effects of a proposal on indigenous biodiversity which includes impacts on wetlands and their functions, including wider functions such as water quality treatment (i.e., nature-based solution).	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy 24 and Policy 47.</p> <p>In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which can be considered in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a qualifying matter under section 80(E)(2)(e).</p>
FS17.36 5	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.46	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow part 40 of OS74.	Support inclusion of a policy on directing matters to consider when determining

				<p>the effects of a proposal on indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Provisions as proposed would help ensure health of wetlands and water quality through nature-based solutions</p>
OS74.51	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain the Papakāinga chapter	<p>Submitter notes and supports the existing Papakāinga chapter in the PDP.</p> <p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy UD.1 and Policy UD.2.</p> <p>Papakāinga provisions are in scope of IPIs under RMA section 80E(1)(b)(ii) which allows for provisions to enable Papakāinga housing in the district. Further, provisions related to marae and development of Māori land may be within scope as a qualifying matter (s6 relationship with ancestral lands).</p>
FS17.37 6	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.52	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Ensure that Deed of Settlement areas are not subject to the District Plan, as this will most effectively provide for the exercise of tino rangatiratanga by Ngāti Toa Rangatira.	<p>Submitter notes and supports the existing Papakāinga chapter in the PDP.</p> <p>Submitter considers there is a role for</p>

				<p>additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy UD.1 and Policy UD.2.</p> <p>Papakāinga provisions are in scope of IPIs under RMA section 80E(1)(b)(ii) which allows for provisions to enable Papakāinga housing in the district. Further, provisions related to marae and development of Māori land may be within scope as a qualifying matter (s6 relationship with ancestral lands).</p>
FS17.37 7	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.53	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	PCC works in partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira to ensure consistency with Proposed RPS Change 1 across the full extent of the District Plan.	<p>Submitter notes and supports the existing Papakāinga chapter in the PDP.</p> <p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy UD.1 and Policy UD.2.</p> <p>Papakāinga provisions are in scope of IPIs under RMA section 80E(1)(b)(ii) which allows for provisions to enable</p>

				Papakāinga housing in the district. Further, provisions related to marae and development of Māori land may be within scope as a qualifying matter (s6 relationship with ancestral lands).
FS17.378	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.55	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Include a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity rules with an associated permitted standard, matter of control or matter of discretion that requires payment of the financial contribution (where not already collected as development contribution) (separate or part of subdivision rule conditions).</p> <p>The method for determining the costs of the contribution may need to be a schedule or appendix. The rule must meet requirements of s77E(2).</p>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy FW.4.</p> <p>Financial contributions provisions are in scope of IPIs under RMA section 80E(1)(b)(i).</p>
FS17.380	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.133	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions

			compared to standard residential developments.	payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
OS74.56	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include discretionary, non-complying or prohibited activity rule where any required financial contribution is not paid.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy FW.4.  Financial contributions provisions are in scope of IPIs under RMA section 80E(1)(b)(i).
FS17.38 1	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.1 34	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
OS74.58	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Submitter seeks that Variation 1 includes amendments to existing provisions or new	Submitter supports the existing renewable energy generation provisions in the PDP which will apply to the

			<p>provisions across the REG, SUB and zone chapters to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise the benefits that renewable energy sources have for greenhouse gas emission reduction.</li> <li>• Include policy to promote energy efficiency in development such as layout in design to maximise solar and renewable energy generation.</li> <li>• Include as a matter of control or discretion for subdivision and comprehensive housing developments how the development provides for solar orientation of buildings to achieve passive solar gain.</li> </ul>	<p>intensification enabled in Variation 1 and PC19.</p> <p>However, Submitter requests that the provisions in the Renewable Energy Generation chapter, the subdivision chapter and the zone rules have regard to Policy 11 in Proposed RPS Change 1.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d).</p>
FS17.38 3	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.67	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include direction in the Three Waters chapter to provide for de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using 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	<p>Submitter supports the requirement to connect to reticulated networks where available.</p> <p>However, Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated</p>



			<p>network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network would still be required.</p> <p>This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.</p>	<p>wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained.</p> <p>Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible. Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45.</p> <p>Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.</p> <p>Infrastructure is a related provision in the scope of an IPI, under Section 80E(2)</p>
FS17.39 2	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.51	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 67 of OS74	Support for de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment plus use of

				<p>connection to the wastewater network if there is network capacity.</p> <p>Badly maintained septic tanks are a known cause of pollution of our streams and harbour. Developments in effective on-site systems go beyond old-style septic tanks and soakage. It makes sense for standards to be described in relation to on-site domestic wastewater treatment and disposal.</p>
FS99.30	Alan Collett	Oppose	Disallow, The reference to septic tanks and effluent soakage systems should remain.	NZ Ministry for the Environment refers to onsite septic tanks and effluent fields as on-site wastewater treatment systems. Law makers need to be aware by restricting alternative solutions under the building act with tighter regulations we can increase the cost of building to the homeowner or developer thereby having a counter effect of trying to deliver affordable housing.
OS74.89	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any other similar relief that would deal with Greater Wellington's concerns set out in this submission; and</li> <li>Any consequential amendments necessary to the IPI arising from this submission.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.41 4	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS74.90	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Not Stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any other similar relief that would deal with Greater Wellington's concerns set out in this submission; and</li> <li>Any consequential amendments necessary to the IPI arising from this submission.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.415	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.1	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	For the most part, the submission on the Proposed Variation and Plan Change is one of general support. Amendments are sought on specific matters, which are summarised further below [see full submission] and in Appendix 1 [see full submission].	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>Provide clarity for all plan users; and Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.669	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100%

				do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.18	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.34	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>

FS127.8	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.2	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>General support for Variation 1. Amendments are sought on specific matters.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–</li> </ul>

				Homes and Communities Act 2019.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.670	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.79	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<b>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <b>be disallowed.</b>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.35	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard

				to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.9	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.8	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Strategic Direction – Amend reference to the tool used to manage effects upon the identified values of scheduled heritage site and settings and sites of significance to Māori.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required</li> </ul>

				<p>under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.67 6	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.73	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.41	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard



				to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.1 5	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.9	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Strategic Direction - include reference to a new Town Centre Zone.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required</li> </ul>

				<p>under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.67 7	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.97	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	<p>Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the</p>

				identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS75.72	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.42	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>

FS127.1 6	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.12	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Residential Zones – generally better reflect design flexibility, planned urban built form, development density and height/daylight expectations.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.68 0	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100%

				do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.69	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.45	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>

FS127.1 9	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.59	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the changes highlighted above or in Appendix 1, 2, and 3 attached [to submission].	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.72 7	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100%

				do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.70	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS32.84	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS75.23	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	<p>legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "</p>
FS99.92	Alan Collett	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government</p>	<p>With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people</p>
FS127.6 6	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.</p>	<p>Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.</p>



OS76.61	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Council should align the Variation 1 with other regional planning documents ahead of the hearings for those documents.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>Submitter has an interest to ensure national and regional consistency in resource management documents across the Wellington Region. From reviewing the Wellington regional plan changes/reviews and associated s32 documentation, Submitter considers it has become apparent that there has been little time for Council's in the region to align their thinking.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
---------	------------------------------------	------------	--	---

FS17.72 9	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.21	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.94	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.68	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.62	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Seeks that the hearing process for the Variation 1 follows that of Plan Change 1 (PC1) to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	So that consistency can be provided across the Wellington region and RMA s73 can be met which requires district plans to “give effect” to the Regional Policy Statement. Similarly, s74(2) also anticipates regional consistency including with matters such as the Regional Land Transport Plan. It is unclear how this has been achieved as PC1 was notified after the Variation and there appears to be misalignment between other plans of the region.
FS17.730	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.95	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both

				and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.69	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.67	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in policies, matters of discretion or assessment, such as and not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Optimise the quality of the built form outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach to the site.</u></li> <li>ii. <u>Achieve visual interest while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li> <li>iii. <u>Achieve driveways, manoeuvring and parking areas that are safe, convenient, and attractive.</u></li> <li>iv. <u>Integrate building form and open space design to achieve high internal</u></li> </ul>	<p>Considers that the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines</p>

			<p><u>amenity and form well-located and usable private open spaces.</u></p> <p>v. <u>Achieve reasonable sunlight, daylight, and outlook.</u></p> <p>vi. <u>Provide reasonable internal visual privacy for all units within a development.</u></p> <p>vii. <u>Ensure outdoor living areas are well-located, functional for the intended use, and high quality.</u></p> <p>viii. <u>Achieve visual amenity, safety, and functionality with planting.</u></p> <p>ix. <u>Achieve high quality, legible and efficient circulation.</u></p> <p>x. <u>Provide for servicing that is suitably generous, convenient, and visually discreet.</u></p>	<p>should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.73 5	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.10 0	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard

				to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.7 4	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.68	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	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>Considers that the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with.</p> <p>Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora</p>

				<p>seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.73 6	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.10 1	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.7 5	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.70	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought [on design guides].	<p>Considers that the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with.</p> <p>Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p>



				<p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.73 8	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.10 3	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.7 7	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have

				been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.97	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Seeks consequential changes throughout the Variation planning maps and provisions to delete reference to “Height Controls – Shading”.	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.765	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.114	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Greater Wellington seeks to retain the controls limiting development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.	Greater Wellington oppose removing the restriction on development on steep slopes where there is possible slope failure hazard. Refer to our further submission on point OS37.1.
FS99.130	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one’s privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.104	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.110	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	All provisions and rules relating to this proposed qualifying matter [shading] are sought to be deleted.	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.778	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.143	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.1 17	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS77.3	Titahi Bay Residents Assn Inc	Not Stated	Submitter endorses the submission of their community advocate with experience in resource management and planning, Brian Warburton, as a preliminary submission.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.41 8	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS78.1	Oil companies - Z Energy Limited & BP Oil NZ Limited & Mobil Oil NZ Limited	Not Stated	Seeks the following general relief:  a. Address the relevant provisions in Sections 5-8 RMA;  b. Give effect to the relevant provisions of the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement (RPS) whilst remaining consistent with relevant provisions of the Wellington Regional Plans;  c. Implement and apply the statutory tests in Section 32 and the requirements in the First Schedule RMA;  d. Only address relevant statutory functions.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

			<p>e. Ensure there is no duplication of other regulation that could give rise to double jeopardy or more than one rule being required for the same activity;</p> <p>f. Avoid, remedy or mitigate the relevant and identified environmental effects; and</p> <p>g. Make any consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission, including any consequential relief required in any other sections of the Proposed District Plan that are not specifically subject of this submission but are required to ensure a consistent approach is taken throughout the document; and h. Any other relief required to give effect to the issues raised in this submission</p>	
FS17.10 27	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS79.1	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Support	The retention and application of plan overlays and consent triggers to protect environmental, cultural and heritage values, to identify coastal, flood and fault hazard zones, and to control development in fragile or unstable environments.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.41 9	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.3 66	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.

OS79.4	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Support	The strengthening and active monitoring of controls on Subdivision and Earthworks to mitigate the adverse effects of intensification.	Given the steep topography and previous events with subsidence in cut & fill subdivisions, significant slips and sedimentation. Recent weather and continuing climate change effects should be acknowledged and used as a trigger both to strengthen requirements on developers and more broadly to exclude low lying and unstable areas from the intensification envisaged by the Act altogether.
FS17.42 2	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.3 69	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS79.5	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Support	The inclusion of the Three Waters chapter – especially the concept of hydraulic neutrality, and the requirement for mitigation where this cannot be met.  Encouragement of developers to achieve hydraulic positivity in key risk areas where developments can actually improve an existing situation.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.42 3	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.90	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all of part 5 of OS79	Strongly support provisions requiring hydraulic neutrality as a bottom line and hydraulic positivity where this can be achieved.

				Housing intensification inevitably creates more hard surfaces and runoff of stormwater. The science on this is well proven. Advances in technology make management possible and affordable in the context of development.
FS127.3 70	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS79.6	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Support	The protection and retention of public outdoor spaces, such as reserve land, parks, recreation areas, and sports grounds.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.42 4	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.3 71	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS81.1	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	Full utilisation of the tools available to Council to enable development in the most accessible urban areas.	Has a role in giving effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). The GPS is required under the LTMA and outlines the Government's strategy to guide land transport investment over the next 10 years. The four strategic priorities of the GPS 2021 are safety, better travel options, climate change and improving freight connections. A key theme of the GPS is integrating land use, transport planning and delivery. Land use planning has a significant impact on transport policy, infrastructure and services provision, and vice versa. Once development has happened, it has a long-

				term impact on transport. Changes in land use can affect the demand for travel, creating both pressures and opportunities for investment in transport infrastructure and services, or for demand management.
FS17.10 35	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.6	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	The HSAA sets out that financial contribution provisions may be included or changed as part of the IPI process (s. 77t). Porirua City Council have not included financial contribution provisions as part of Variation 1. Council do however have a Development Contributions Policy which requires developers to contribute towards infrastructure. Expects that any regionally significant infrastructure required as part of land use, subdivision or development would require financial contributions under this policy.
FS17.10 40	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.1	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Porirua has a chance to become a proper, grownup city that gives people a real city experience in concert with a beautiful healthy harbour and nearby nature, if it embraces the consequential changes to its urban fabric.



				<p>This means leaning into density done well, leaning into people-friendly streets, leaning into reducing people’s need to travel by car to do the everyday functions of life.</p> <p>Embracing these things, and the consequent changes to our urban fabric – that compact, low-emissions urban form in our Growth Strategy – will mean we can actually start becoming a city that’s actually great to live in when you’re a child, young person or old person. It will mean we can start becoming a place where being a resident doesn’t mean you’re forced to be a high emitter of climate-heating gases, or give your household spending dollar dominantly to big offshore-owned conglomerates.</p> <p>It will mean we’re better placed to think and talk and agree about resilience, retreat, and the vast changes to our familiar patterns that will be demanded – not asked – by climate change.</p> <p>The DP is a vital lever on the complex dashboard of influences upon our city’s urban form. Let’s pull it with emphasis: we won’t have this chance for a long time, and we’ll be shaping our city hugely between now and then.</p>
FS17.10 86	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS83.2	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	<p><b>Emissions reduction and VKT reduction need to be added to the Objectives of both documents.</b></p>	<p>Active travel should be the first-best choice for residents of the entire of Plimmerton Farm: all zones.</p> <p>The objective needs to be specific enough that building-out of Plimmerton Farm can only be done with street forms and transport networks that deliver on this objective. This includes by making private car driving less convenient (tighter corners, more constrained driving spaces, street environments with high place value that are self-explaining to a maximum of 30kph, discouragement from developers providing one or more carpark per dwelling), while making active travel extremely convenient, pleasant and attractive for people at all hours of day and night, for all ages and stages.</p> <p>It is simply ludicrous that professional transport engineers would proudly state that a greenfield development's roading layout and cross-sections meets NZS404, and then drop the proverbial mic, yet this is what will continue to happen without explicit, and specific, objectives.</p> <p>Cross sections provided by the submitter to the Hearing Commissioners are a starting point for standards.</p>
FS17.10 87	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100%

				do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.32	Alan Collett	Oppose	Disallow, seek that any such anti vehicle ideology be excluded as ill-informed if it restricts day to day commerce such as trades and deliveries and emergency response activities.	The submitter is forgetting about emergency first response vehicles such as fire appliances and ambulances. Tighter narrower streets, occupants forced to park their cars on the street all make for difficult access in times of emergency.
OS83.8	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	Add the Coalition for More Homes' proposals for outdoor living space and green space..	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' proposals for outdoor living space and green space and suggest these are added.
FS17.10 93	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.9	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	Small-scale commercial activity should be controlled or permitted or restricted discretionary, rather than the proposed discretionary.	For example public-facing businesses under 35 m2 with operating hours between 7am and 9pm, without car carparking on the frontage, and especially where the business is activating a street frontage, providing and maintaining enhanced public realm (such as public seating, planters, a water-fountain, pātaka kai).
FS17.10 94	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.10	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	The scale of commercial activities that are permitted in these zones should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	There are very low limits on children involved in daycare as a permitted activity, and this should be increased especially if the provider is prioritising

				sustainable travel of those children to the daycare.
FS17.10 95	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.16	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Traffic effects in the transition: helpful</p> <p>The increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, is not wholly a negative effect despite what the RMA would say. It can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets as we progress on the journey to properly-configured streets that support our neighbourhoods. I wish to see traffic congestion and parking effects considered and used as such.</p> <p>We should remember that Porirua has a large number of extremely unsafe streets at present due to their design: the street environment encourages people to drive far too fast.</p> <p>More people living close to things that people want to do, and not yet confident to get rid of their own cars, meaning street parking becomes more highly used, is actually a very cheap and effective way of traffic calming when offset either side of a street. (The slight extra hassle is also a helpful additional nudge to those marginal decisions of whether to take the car a short trip).</p> <p>Lots of cars parked offset in a street, plus using measures like modal filters and</p>

				<p>formal traffic calming, will dissuade people from trying to drive fast down the streets in the first place.</p> <p>And because it's the neighbours and customers of businesses on those streets who are the ones navigating their cars through there, they have an incentive to take care and drive judiciously whereas people just rat-running or transiting through at speed will be dissuaded from using those streets at all, making them safer and more pleasant.</p>
FS17.11 01	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS84.6	Oyster Management Limited	Not Stated	Such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.	[Not specified, refer to original submission]
FS17.11 10	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS85.9	Metlifecare Limited	Not Stated	Seeks such other additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.44 6	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS87.1	Vanessa Jackson	Not Stated	How do you make my street safe? Provide enough parking for existing residents and new with housing intensification? Will you	Car parking and traffic through the street due to intensification of housing

			<p>create drive on for the high side that doesn't have it like on Te Pene at the councils expense? Therefore creating access to new houses off of the road side???</p>	<p>Cannot afford to move nor to improve my circumstances. Has lived in the same home for over 23yrs.</p> <p>Lives in Taupiri Crescent. There is very little parking available for residents as half the street does not have drive on access. It is already becoming over intensified with houses and parking. It's got 3 speed bumps due to the cars the use it as a race track, near a primary school, the dirt bikes use it to race through, some even stay at a house on the street. Children cycle on the wrong side of the road and one corner is blind into the street. Someone is going to get killed. Concerned is that if more housing eg 3 houses per existing property then there will be no where to park for residents without drive on access to their properties. The street is already targeted regularly by those who break into/steal cars.</p> <p>Understands the need for more people to use public transport but as a community we are not there yet. Transport is not as regular or reliable as it should be. Do not make my street more dangerous than it has already become.</p>
FS17.450	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS87.2	Vanessa Jackson	Not Stated	How do existing residents get to protect their right to direct sunlight on their property and passive heating it creates as they currently have?	<p>Affect of loss of sun and the passive heating it gives.</p> <p>Concerned about a 3 or 5 story building being built on the recently sold rental properties next to submitter's property. It has been brought by a property developer overseas who will never have to live with the repercussions or effects of the changes they make. The submitter relies on passive heating to heat their home. If new housing was built would lose the sun that heats the home. [The sun] would only get the roof, my windows would be in the shade. Due to the way the house is positioned on property it would be severely affected, mould would become a constant issue and most of the yard would be a bog. That doesn't take into account loss of privacy.</p> <p>Cannot afford to move nor to improve circumstances. I have lived in my home for over 23yrs.</p>
FS17.45 1	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS87.3	Vanessa Jackson	Not Stated	How do existing residents get to protect their right to have the wind considered as a hazard due to changes that would result from intensification?	<p>Affect of wind due to higher buildings creating wind tunnels on my house and property.</p> <p>Concerned about a 3 or 5 story building being built on the recently sold rental</p>

				<p>properties next to the submitter's house. It has been brought by a property developer overseas who will never have to live with the repercussions or affects of the changes they make. Concerned about the way wind would be affected in relation to submitter's property. The street is a wind tunnel as it is, and the wind can be very intense. Due to the way submitter's house is positioned on the property, concerned it would be severely affected. Submitter does not want to lose a window or titles off their home. Cannot afford the repair. On a very tiny limited income.</p> <p>Cannot afford to move nor to improve circumstances. Has lived in their home for over 23yrs</p>
FS17.45 2	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS87.4	Vanessa Jackson	Not Stated	How do existing residents get to protect their right to quiet enjoyment and privacy as they currently have?	<p>Antisocial neighbors in an intensified housing area, loss of quite enjoyment of my house and property, loss of privacy.</p> <p>Brought property because the house was well removed from the roadside and therefore a safe quite place to raise family and enjoy my quite lifestyle. With intensification would lose privacy, the quite enjoyment they currently enjoy and [which] protects mental health. The home is my safe place. A respite from the</p>



				noise and presence of others. With the possibility of 3 – 5 story buildings on a property and maybe 3 of such you would be severely changing the dynamic not only of the neighborhood but the reason submitter invested in their property in the first place. It was quite, private, well removed from the street and safe. There are many other streets that could handle intensification without destroying/diminishing the lifestyle of those who live in it.
FS17.45 3	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS88.6	Nash Alexander	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Additional comments – sunshine and sun plane. There are legion examples in news media where new developments have caused issues for neighbours as there has been no requirement to consult. Neighbours are often those who are best placed to provide direct feedback and assistance on the placement of new buildings, particularly where sun planes and recessions are involved. That goes directly to shading, and enjoyment of ones own home. Sitting outside on a nice summer day and enjoying the afternoon sun in one year, and then the next only getting 2 hours of sunlight because some 3 storey monstrosities have been built right on the boundary line, thus causing a deleterious

				effect on sunshine received, is nobody's idea of fun.
FS17.459	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS88.7	Nash Alexander	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Additional comments – carpark</p> <p>Perhaps the most inimical idea that arises from the central planning idea of imposition of a free for all, is the quaint notion that people will not have cars, and we will all live in a utopia where public transport is easily accessible and available for everyone to use. That is simply not the case.</p> <p>Notes that the requirement to provide carparks (is, or may be) removed when it comes to building a dwelling. This is problematic where there will be no driveways as the aim of developers will be to maximise site coverage with houses, not access.</p> <p>Submitter had two houses built next to them, where once there was one, on a street where it is on street carparking. There were no issues with carparks as generally, each house had 2 cars maximum. The houses were built (following a non-notified consent). Chaos ensued as the 2 new houses brought a further 6 cars to the street. We later found out that the 'evidence' that had</p>

				<p>been provided regarding on street carparking as not being an issue for an extra 2 houses had purported to show sufficient carparks because the photos had been taken during weekdays, around lunchtime, when obviously people were at work. Had we have been notified of the plan to build 2 houses, would have raised the issue of the on street carparking. Replicating that idiocy, across Porirua, will ensure many more cars parked on the street, and on the berms, and wherever people could generally find a spot to park their car.</p> <p>That is an issue that also needs to be realistically assessed and appraised. People will hardly ever go and do their weekly shop and bring it all back on public transport. Cars are (unfortunately) still required for many aspects of daily life in NZ. Any development that attempts to shoehorn in multiple units on a single site with little to no parking requirements is asking for ongoing issues as far as street parking is considered.</p>
FS17.460	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS91.6	Russell Morrison	Not Stated	As Submitter mentioned in earlier submission, there will also be many other pressures put on community by the extra northern population. Assurances should be	Some of these will be welcomed by businesses and shops, etc. Others, however, may well require significant expenditure by the community (via rates)

			sought from PCC that these sorts of matters can be provided for in a timely manner without damaging the character of our existing communities and the environment.	to allow for the additional numbers to be coped with. For instance, it is likely that there will be a need for extra boat launching and trailer parking facilities. Extra parking for commuters will need to be catered for. Dog exercise areas and enforcement resources will also be put under pressure.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.470	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS93.1	Alfaaz Lateef	Not Stated	Seeks that the council express their views on existing covenants on the Navigation Drive subdivision, and that the Council contributes and supports to either varying the covenant or amending it to enable further housing intensification.  Submitter would like to understand if anyone else from the Navigation Drive subdivision has requested the covenant to be varied considering the proposed and operative district plan.	The Submitter's property under the proposed variation is being categorized as residing under the medium density residential zone from general residential zone. This variation enables the Submitter to further contribute to the purpose of enabling a growing city and increase housing intensification.  With the size of this section and the ability to build more residential units, the Submitter is proposing to build three more apartment dwellings, housing three more families. Of course, once the planning process initiates, the apartments will be design to the standards conforming to the proposed variations.

				<p>Currently the Navigation Drive sub-division has a covenant over it which restricts more than one dwelling being built on it even if the section size allows for more than one dwelling to be built.</p> <p>The Submitter understands that the sub-division covenants are a matter between the owners of the properties and the sub-divider. However, with need for more housing and a growing demand and considering our section being converted to medium density residential zone by the council, the covenant does not serve much purpose and will be an obstacle in enabling further housing intensification.</p>
OS101.3	Melissa Story	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	When the Aotea subdivision was in place, the local school Papakowhai encountered major issues of overcrowding We must learn from the past and not repeat this mistake. Plimmerton School cannot house any more pupils. A new school will be required.
FS17.11 17	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS102.5	James Hadley Bond	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Not opposed to intensification within Porirua City but has concerns that mitigation for preservation of ecosystems and landscapes will not be fully addressed, in an effort to reduce the cost of and speed up development.

				Environmental impact. What will be done to protect landscapes and habitats?
FS17.49 6	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS111.6	Pukerua Bay School BOT	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>This development proposal and associated District Plan and Structure Plan present several significant concerns to the future of Pukerua Bay School. The school understands the likelihood of significant disruption to the community and School during and following the development and a significant change to the feel and operation of the community and the school.</p> <p>As a school, they realise that more intensive housing development is a government imperative and that they have no other option than to embrace it. Some of their community want things to remain unchanged, others see the potential for improvements to school infrastructure, recreation facilities and services for children, and for safer and more robust access from a child's home to the school.</p> <p>Approach to submission is to both identify points where suitable or stronger protections can be built into the plans, and to suggest changes or additions that would improve the quality of community infrastructure, access and flow of children</p>

				and families to and from Pukerua Bay School, and ultimately better educational outcomes for tamariki.
FS17.528	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.500	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Impacts on education as well as the new recreation provisions need to be noted.
OS112.10	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Support	Alternatively if the ISPP process unable to adopt the sought relief, that the permitted activity performance standards contained within PC19 and VA1 for High and Medium Density housing include reference to the potential effects of Regionally Significant Infrastructure.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
OS114.5	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	Seeks new overlays in relation to High Density Residential and MDRS zoning and lands returned under the Ngāti Toa Deed of Settlement Act (2014). Council to identify all such land and create overlay of 'Ngāti Toa Zone' by defining this overlay as: <i>is a zone where Ngāti Toa has uninhibited Tino Rangatiratanga and Mana as the Tangata Whenua.</i>  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]	Te Rūnanga are concerned that giving effect to NPS-UD by up-zoning areas in Porirua to enable high intensification and implementing MDRS rules, create an issue for Rūnanga for the lands returned under the Ngāti Toa Deed of Settlement Act (2014). This concern is valid also for any land that Ngāti Toa will or may purchase as part of their cultural redress and first right of refusal processes.  This is a major risk for Rūnanga and its people in terms of upholding their Tino rangatiratanga over the whenua they claimed back.  Te Rūnanga observe that the arbitrary requirements coming from the IPI and MDRS implementation mean that Ngāti Toa will end up with zoning that it may not be desirable for the future use of their land. Since Te Rūnanga have not received or claimed these lands yet, Te Rūnanga would like these areas to be exempt from an imposed District Plan zoning.

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]
FS17.53 3	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.16 8	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support the proposed new overlays.	Greater Wellington strongly support the new overlays requested by the submitter.
FS127.3 96	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS118.1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Variation 1 needs to adequately address the critical need for retirement accommodation and aged care in the District.	New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD). <sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing



				<p>choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.3	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.3	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide a clear and consistent regime for retirement villages.	<p>New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and</p>

				<p>urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD).<sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.5	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.5	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	That the potential effects from retirement villages are managed proportionately and efficiently with the least regulation and prescription necessary.	<p>New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the</p>

				<p>ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD).<sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.7	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.7	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	The significant benefits of retirement villages need to be given appropriate weight.	<p>New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic</p>

				<p>changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD).<sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.9	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.10	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Variation 1 must include a restricted discretionary activity rule for retirement villages in all relevant residential zones.	<p>Promoting the wellbeing of older persons within our communities requires district plans to better enable the construction of new retirement villages. In the experience of RVA members, cumbersome, rigid and uncertain resource management processes and</p>

				<p>practices are a major impediment to delivering necessary retirement housing and care. Resource consent processes take too long, are unnecessarily complex, and often do not provide for retirement living options properly because the relevant plans are not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Variation 1 and PC19 represent a major opportunity to better enable the provision of a diverse range of retirement housing and care options. If this opportunity is not taken now, the existing consenting challenges facing retirement village operators are likely to be perpetuated for many years. Council must take this step in order to give effect to the NPSUD through Variation 1 and PC19. The NPSUD specifically recognises that well-functioning urban environments enable all people and communities to provide for their wellbeing, health and safety (Objective 1). Achieving this wellbeing objective in relation to older persons within our community means providing for the specific housing and care needs of those people.</p> <p>The NPSUD also states that contributing to well-functioning urban environments means enabling a “variety of homes” to meet the “needs ... of different households” (Policy 1), and that cannot be achieved in our major centres without</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>enabling significant intensification of our urban environments (Policy 3). These NPSUD policies therefore require Variation 1 and PC19 to specifically respond to the need to provide suitable and diverse housing choices and options for our ageing population as part of the intensification of urban environments.</p> <p>The Enabling Housing Act builds on the NPSUD as part of the Government's response to reduce barriers to housing supply. The Enabling Housing Act puts in place specific requirements to provide for medium density housing as a minimum in all relevant residential zones (MDRS). Retirement villages will not be permitted activities under the MDRS because of the "no more than 3 residential units per site" density standard (clause 10). However, retirement villages require "the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site". They will therefore be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.12	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.1 1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Ensure that the Porirua District Plan specifically and appropriately provides for and enables retirement villages in all	In order to meet the Enabling Housing Act requirements, to give effect to the NPSUD, and respond to the significant health and wellbeing issues created by

			<p>relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones.</p>	<p>the current retirement housing and care crisis.</p> <p>Important to emphasise that the Enabling Housing Act does not only require Tier 1 councils to implement the medium density requirements in relevant residential zones but also to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSUD regarding intensification of urban environments. Accordingly, Variation 1 and PC19 also needs to enable intensification (through building heights and densities) that responds to the location of centres and rapid transit stops. In some cases, that intensification is to include “building heights of at least 6 storeys” and must achieve the objective of enabling more people to live in areas where there is a high demand for housing (Objective 3 of the NPSUD).</p> <p>This outcome can only be achieved by providing for a retirement village-specific objective, policy and rule framework. In the experience of RVA members, without a specific framework, retirement village proposals face material uncertainty and consenting barriers as council officers attempt to apply general residential approaches that are not fit-for-purpose to retirement villages.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS67.13	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.1 3	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity.	A key issue with many existing district plans is their failure to explicitly recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity. This issue has resulted in consenting challenges with members of the community, and sometimes even council officers, taking the view that retirement villages are non-residential activities that should only be provided for in non-residential zones or seeking to assess different parts of a village in a different manner (such as a commercial activity). Retirement villages are clearly a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. Retirement villages do provide a range of ancillary services, however those services are provided for residents only and complement the residential function of retirement villages by meeting the particular needs of older residents. The residential nature of retirement villages is reflected in the definition, which recognises the key function of villages as a "residential complex or facilities" for the provision of "residential accommodation for people who are retired". This recognition requires that retirement villages as a land use are a permitted activity. In line with



				the Enabling Housing Act, the construction of retirement villages (being four or more residential units on a site) can be regulated as a restricted discretionary activity.
FS67.15	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.14	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Better enable housing and care for the ageing population.	<p>Promoting the wellbeing of older persons within our communities requires district plans to better enable the construction of new retirement villages. Cumbersome, rigid and uncertain resource management processes and practices are a major impediment to delivering necessary retirement housing and care. Resource consent processes take too long, are unnecessarily complex, and often do not provide for retirement living options properly because the relevant plans are not fit for purpose.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.16	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.20	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites.	Sites in existing residential areas that are appropriate for retirement villages are extremely rare, due to the need for sites to be large enough to accommodate all parts of a village and be located in close proximity to community services and amenities. Given large sites are a rare resource, it is important they are developed efficiently to maximise the

				benefits from their development. This approach is consistent with the enabling intensification approach of the NPSUD. As well as providing intensification opportunities, large sites also provide unique opportunities to internalise potential impacts of intensification on neighbours and the neighbourhood. For example, additional height can be located towards the centre of a site without adverse dominance, shading or privacy effects. This approach was adopted in the Auckland Unitary Plan, with the residential zones including a policy to enable more efficient use of larger sites.
FS67.22	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.2 2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Recognise the unique internal amenity needs of retirement villages.	A key consenting challenge faced by the RVA members is an expectation from council officers that the internal amenity controls used for traditional housing typologies (e.g. outlook, sunlight, privacy, outdoor living spaces, landscaping and the like) are appropriate for retirement villages. This approach fails to recognise the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages (discussed above). For example, residents have access to a wide range of communal spaces as well as their individual homes, so their amenity is provided by the village as a whole rather than an individual space. This means that internal amenity standards, such as outlook space, do not

				<p>have the same level of relevance to retirement villages as to typical residential housing. Other factors, such as proximity to communal spaces, may be more relevant to the overall level of amenity experienced by residents. This approach also fails to recognise that retirement village operators have a long and positive track record and understanding of what works for their residents. Over many years they have provided high quality environments for their residents – significantly better than typical housing typologies have delivered. Retirement village operators rely on their reputation, which would be quickly diminished by bad publicity. The quality of life provided to residents is therefore paramount to the RVA’s members.</p> <p>There are two internal amenity standards in the Enabling Housing Act that require amendment when applied to retirement villages:</p> <p>Outdoor living space: Retirement villages provide a range of private and communal outdoor areas that can be enjoyed by residents. All of these areas should be counted towards this amenity standard. In addition, retirement village residents tend to spend a significant amount of their recreational time inside, given their sensitivity to temperature extremes. A</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>proportion of these indoor areas should also be counted towards this amenity standard to reflect the actual usage patterns of village residents.</p> <p>Outlook space: The standard is not workable for all units across a comprehensive site. Furthermore, such a standard is simply not needed. Residents of a village have a much greater degree of choice of 'living rooms' than residents of typical residential dwellings (including communal sitting areas, dining rooms, a library, activity room and chapel). These communal spaces are typically well orientated for daylight and enjoying an outlook into a large and attractive outdoor space.</p>
FS67.24	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.2 4	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide clear and focused matters of discretion.	<p>Faced significant cost and delay in consenting retirement villages in residential zones. Often, the process requirements are significantly out of proportion with the adverse effects of the activity, and do not recognise its substantial benefits. An example of this issue is excessive and extraneous information requests. Over time, the amount of information that is required to support an application for consent has substantially increased. Council officers often request information that is not relevant to the assessment of the effects</p>

				<p>of a retirement village proposal, such as information regarding electricity supply, internal lighting, hallway width, planter box size, and outdoor furniture. It is not uncommon to receive unsolicited design change requests from council urban designers. These requests add cost and delay, and distract from the key issues. Council officers have too much discretion to require applicants to provide further information, and have the ability to wield the threat of notification if the requested information is not provided. By way of example, one RVA member received seven requests for further information following lodgement of an application, which resulted in a five month delay in the decision being issued. Another application resulted in four further information requests and a four month delay.</p> <p>It is therefore important that matters of discretion for decision-making are clear and focused on the aspects that matter.</p>
FS67.26	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.26	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide appropriately focused notification rules.	<p>Notification is a significant cause of the cost and delay of consenting processes. RMA processes currently provide multiple opportunities for opposition to projects, which is the reason for significant delays in processing consents, and does not ensure good outcomes. Notification is often a cause of much angst for</p>

				<p>developers. 'NIMBYism' is rife. Self-interested neighbours can create huge delays and disputes for no material environmental benefit. Although notification has an important role in the RM system, it must be proportional to the issues at hand. It is only beneficial, and should only be required, where notification is likely to uncover information that will assist the decision-making process. The costs of public notification are too high for it to be required simply for persons to 'be heard'. Applications for residential activities that are anticipated in residential zones (i.e. through restricted discretionary activity status) should not be publicly notified. Rather, the time for public participation is at plan making stage where residential zones and appropriate/inappropriate activities can be clearly identified. This approach aligns with the Enabling Housing Act which precludes public notification for residential proposals. Limited notification should remain available as it provides for neighbours to participate when they are likely to be impacted by a next-door development. However, given the significant costs associated with notification, it should only be required where it will benefit the decision-making process. Where an application meets the expectations for development in an area (i.e. through</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				compliance with external amenity standards), there should be no need for limited notification. This approach aligns with the Enabling Housing Act which precludes limited notification for residential proposals that comply with relevant standards.
FS67.28	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.28	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Use the MDRS as a guideline.	The Enabling Housing Act sets medium density residential standards that guide when residential activities require closer assessment and when limited notification of proposals can be available. The retirement village-specific framework sought by the [submitter] takes a similar approach (given retirement villages are a form of development with four or more residential units) with the standards informing matters of discretion and limited notification presumptions. The Enabling Housing Act will result in a level of standardisation that will set expectations for the scale of development across the country. The standards have been deemed to 'cover the ground' in relation to the key matters relevant to residential proposals. With some amendments to reflect the specific nature of retirement villages, the standards also set a relevant baseline for identifying standards relevant for the construction of retirement villages. It is important Variation 1 does not

				inadvertently make retirement village developments more difficult to consent, construct and operate than standard residential development. Such an outcome would significantly exacerbate the retirement housing and care crisis that is already resulting in poor wellbeing outcomes for older people.
FS67.30	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.30	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide for retirement villages in commercial and mixed use zones.	Generally seek to locate villages in established, good quality residential areas, as these locations are most suited for residents to 'age in place'. Due to the lack of suitable sites in existing residential areas and need to respond to the retirement living and care crisis, also operate retirement villages in some commercial and mixed use zones where there is good access to services and amenities. The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and also requires councils to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones through the Enabling Housing Supply plan changes. Policy 3 of the NPSUD requires Variation 1 and PC19 to enable intensification (through building heights and densities) that respond to the location of centres and rapid transit stops. City centre, metropolitan centre, neighbourhood centre, local centre and town centre zones in particular provide opportunities



				for retirement villages as these areas serve the surrounding local communities and provide close access for amenities to residents who are often unable to walk long distances. Residents' wellbeing is improved when social engagement and intergenerational activities are easily accessible. Many general business areas are also located between centres and residential areas and therefore potentially suitable for retirement villages.
FS67.32	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.3 1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that Variation 1 is amended to provide a fit-for-purpose retirement-village specific framework.	To address the issues outlined.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS67.33	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.3 3	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amendments to the MDRS are required to ensure they are workable to retirement villages.	Supports the incorporation of the MDRS into the Proposed Plan without any amendments that read down or alter their interpretation. The amendments do not change the intent of the MDRS.
FS67.35	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.3 5	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amendments to other Proposed Plan provisions.	[The amendments sought are] necessary to ensure there is no conflict, overlap or inconsistency with the MDRS. For example, RESZ-P7 and P8 set out extensive requirements (a number of which are not relevant to encouraging 'high quality' development) for

				development not meeting permitted activity standards. These policies therefore conflict with RESZ-P6 (and Policy 5 of the MDRS) to provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status. A failure to make these amendments will give rise to significant interpretation issues and uncertainty when the Plan is applied.
FS67.37	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.50	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in the submission.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS67.52	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
FS127.501	Rebecca Davis	Support	Allow	It is essential for FENZ to be able to access buildings and have resources available.

## 32-General > 32.2-New provision

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS16.7	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	All affected property owners must be notified of any consent applications. Affected property owners are based on the number of levels of the development. One storey – immediately adjacent properties (360 degrees). Two stories - immediately adjacent properties (360 degrees) plus one.	[No specific reasons given]

			Three stories - immediately adjacent properties (360 degrees) plus two. And so on.	
OS18.1	Hapu Housing Solutions Limited	Amend	Adoption of a Papakāinga Provision within the District Plan	The council should be committed to providing a section specifically for papakāinga developments on ancestral Māori land, as part of the proposed district plan. The provisions should reflect this commitment by providing a permitted activity status for papakāinga developments on Māori freehold land, provided that it can be demonstrated that the land has the capacity to cater for the development and that certain amenity standards are met. A restricted discretionary activity status should also be applied for “General land owned by Māori” that is either the subject of proceedings before the Māori Land Court to convert it to Maori freehold land, or where an ancestral link has been identified. On all other land, papakāinga developments should be adopted as non-complying activities.
FS17.39	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS119.1	Fiona Daniel	Support	Not stated	Supports the incorporation of a Papakāinga Provision inside the District Plan, as required by the Resource Management Act.  Support the inclusion of such documentation to allow for Mana Whenua to be given the right to build on historical Whenua Maori.

OS72.2	KiwiRail	Amend	Seeks a 5m setback be introduced into all zones adjoining the rail corridor which fall within the scope of Variation 1.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.299	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.4	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic</p>

				objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.329	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.33	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
FS114.59	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	We seek that the part of this submission requesting including a policy for mana whenua to be involved in mapping and identifying indigenous biodiversity and taonga species to be allowed.	Suggested policy will further enable and empower mana whenua to be more involved in the mapping process. Currently, mapping of taonga species are done differently by different councils; bringing provisions at Policy level will specify the

				mapping process for all parties and clarifies the role Mana Whenua has. This will provide us to sustain mātauranga Māori and build the skills of our iwi members.
OS74.8	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that</p>

				recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.333	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.37	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
FS59.12	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Oppose	Disallow the submission points where they result in an unknown outcome for the Northern Growth Area.	The planning provisions in the PDP must be certain and provide for the objectives in the Plan. The submission points do not provide certainty and do not promote integrated management.
OS74.9	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a policy and amend relevant rules that requires hydrological controls as defined in Proposed RPS Change 1 for use,	Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1

			development and subdivision of land (Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.3(j)).	<p>direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p>
FS17.334	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.



FS32.38	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.
OS74.13	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a policy and objective to protect and enhance the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, including wetlands	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the</p>

				scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.338	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.42	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of

				intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
FS59.14	Pukerua Property Group Limited	Oppose	Disallow the submission points where they result in an unknown outcome for the Northern Growth Area.	The planning provisions in the PDP must be certain and provide for the objectives in the Plan. The submission points do not provide certainty and do not promote integrated management.
OS74.14	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>As a matter of control or discretion for subdivision and any other applicable activity, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>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</li> <li>any financial contribution or development contribution required for any offsite stormwater quality and quantity treatment.</li> </ul>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional freshwater provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy FW.2; Policy FW.3, and Policy 15.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested. Scope is available to do this through the ISPP, as a qualifying matter applies, being section 6 of the RMA. Stormwater management and infrastructure, including water supply, are also included as related provisions in the scope of an IPI as related provisions under section 80E(2). The PDP has a number of strategic objectives, for example TW-O1 to TW-O4 and NE-O2, that provide for active partnership with Ngāti Toa Rangatira, enable kaitiakitanga and protect the cultural and spiritual values of Ngāti Toa Rangatira. These strategic objectives do not</p>

				appear to have supporting policies aside from those that manage sites and areas of significance to Māori. The strategic objectives provide a good overview of the strategic direction for the PDP. There does not appear to be an objective that recognises ki uta ki tai and requires natural and physical resources to be managed in an integrated manner as required by the NPS-FM and Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.339	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.43	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
FS118.136	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as: - the extent to which the subdivision, use or

				<p>development effects water quality, waterway values including hydrological and ecosystem processes, riparian margins, water users and cultural values is a matter which should be properly considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the extent to which the stormwater infrastructure contributes to amenity, recreational, cultural, ecological and climate values in addition to its engineering purpose is not suitable as a matter of control or discretion, as it does not respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment; and</li> <li>- Council's development contributions policy already requires contributions for Network Infrastructure, which includes stormwater.</li> </ul>
OS74.17	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Add an 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).</p>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>

FS17.342	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.49	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the objective.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new objective. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.
OS74.21	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a 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.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.  In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.
FS17.346	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.50	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the policies due to the implications it may have to carry out their statutory obligations.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new policies. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.
FS118.137	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	The submitter seeks support in part and allow in part.	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle however the RVA's primary position is that while retirement

			Allow submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	villages may meet the thresholds for high generating activities, this is not based on the activity itself and rather the residential development threshold and the RVA would seek to be exempt from these standards.
OS74.25	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Add a policy that requires the provision of infrastructure in subdivision development that supports modal shift and consideration of how design can reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.  In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.
FS17.350	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.51	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the policy.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new policy. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.
OS74.26	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Add a 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.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy

				<p>CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>
FS17.351	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.31	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include policies which seek to improve climate resilience of urban areas through measures identified in RPS Change 1 Policy CC.14.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy CC.4 and Policy CC.14</p> <p>In regard to scope, climate-resilient urban areas may be considered in the scope of the IPI under section 80E(2)(a) as a district-wide matter.</p>
FS17.356	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.32	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include policies and rules for any greenfield development areas that require the development to include actions and initiatives that improve climate resilience.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy CC.4 and Policy CC.14



				In regard to scope, climate-resilient urban areas may be considered in the scope of the IPI under section 80E(2)(a) as a district-wide matter.
FS17.357	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.63	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	A proposed Town Centre Zone chapter is sought and included in Appendix 2 [to submission]  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.731	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

FS74.100	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS75.20	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not

				be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.96	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.70	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.274	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Adopt and include a new Town Centre Zone chapter, with consequential updates to maps.	Seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. Mana provides a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs.

				<p>The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area).</p> <p>A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided in support of this submission.</p>
FS17.942	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.102	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in

				the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS99.307	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.196	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Allow submission point, pending an amendment to the retirement village activity status.	The RVA supports this inclusion in principle, but would seek to change the proposed activity status of retirement villages from restricted discretionary to permitted in accordance with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.281	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.275	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Accept the proposed Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of this submission.	<p>Seeking that Mana is recognised as a Town Centre Zone. Mana provides a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs.</p> <p>The introduction of a Town Centre Zone for Mana is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that this centre services (both now and into the future with the expansion of the Northern Growth Area).</p> <p>A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided in support of this submission.</p>
FS17.943	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.103	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	<p>Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately</p>

				fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS99.308	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.197	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Allow submission point, pending an amendment to the retirement village activity status.	The RVA supports this inclusion in principle, but would seek to change the proposed activity status of retirement villages from restricted discretionary to permitted in accordance with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.282	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not

				consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS83.7	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Add a permeability standard, such as that 30-40% of sites should be permeable.	<p>In combination with getting rid of setbacks at the front of sites, this will encourage people to put more dwellings on a smaller or the same footprint, and dissuades people doing extensively earthworked drive-on access with internal garages on a hill-slope property.</p> <p>Permeability enables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) less uncontrolled earthworking putting sediment into the waterways and sea (because council enforcement teams are perpetually underfunded versus the tasks of enforcing things like small-scale sediment controls on small construction sites)</li> <li>ii) less runoff (as required by the Waitua chapter of the Natural Resources Plan and PCC's own Harbour Strategy and updated Bylaw), and</li> <li>iii) less destruction of vegetation especially on hill slopes (e.g. behind Paremata hills).</li> </ul> <p>And it lets neighbourhoods get more residents without lots more cars – more</p>



				homes with walk-up access like those in the bush-clad Wellington suburbs.
FS17.1092	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.100	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow the suggested amendment in part 7 of OS83.	The request for an amendment to add a permeability standard, such as that 30-40% of sites should be permeable is supported.  Permeable surfaces will help avoid the run-off associated with hard surfaces and therefore reduce the risk of flooding and sediment flows which ultimately end up in streams and the harbour.
OS83.17	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	<b>Add provisions to encourage development of the “missing middle”.</b>	The availability of a range of housing typologies is a major issue in Porirua and looks likely to be deliberately perpetuated by Council actions, due to the flawed and apparently entirely baseless assumptions about “market desires” for housing: that Porirua people will overwhelmingly only ever want to live in detached homes (see the HCBA discussion in Other comments). Specific provisions are needed to encourage the “missing middle” that’s not two-storey townhouses with garages.
FS17.1102	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS85.8	Metlifecare Limited	Not Stated	Seeks a new rule [in residential zones] that provides for “Construction of buildings for a retirement village” as a restricted discretionary activity subject to the following matters of discretion:	As currently drafted the construction of a retirement village would also require resource consent (under the general building / structure rules in the High Density and Medium Density Residential zones).

		<p>(a) RESZ-P3 (Safety and street scene quality);  (b) RESZ – P4 (Health and well-being);  (c) RESZ-P5 (Buildings and structures);  (d) RESZ-P13 (Retirement Villages);  (e) RESZ-P[x] (explained in separate point);  and  (f) the extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards: MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6.</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan provides that “all buildings and structures” that infringe one or more of the built form standards (i.e. buildings with greater than three units) are a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion relate to the specific standards that are not met. For example, for more than three units, the matter of discretion is consistency with the Residential Design Guide.</p> <p>Generally supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments. It also supports that the rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>However, not all of the standards that relate to the construction of buildings and structures are applicable to retirement village development. For example, outdoor living space (per unit) and outlook space (per unit) requirements should not apply to retirement village development as these types of developments are designed for older residents and generally have communal outdoor spaces (which are maintained by the village provider) rather than individual backyard or outdoor living areas that would need to be maintained by the residents. There are also a range of</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>housing typologies within a retirement village including dementia care units where the provision of outlook space should not unnecessarily constrain the design of these care facilities. (b) the relevant matters of discretion are the general residential policies for all residential zones (not including the retirement village specific policy). These do not refer to retirement villages or the policy applicable to retirement villages and do not recognise the specific functional and operational needs of retirement village development.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice.</p>
FS17.445	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS101.1	Melissa Story	Not Stated	Each dwelling should provide at least one car space for every two people living in the dwelling.	Concerns about the safety of cars parked on the road (in terms of potential theft, obstructing bicycles and moving vehicles). This should also apply to shared driveways,

				i.e. intensification should go ahead provided off street carparking can be provided.
FS17.1115	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS118.42	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Provide tailored and fit for purpose retirement village matters of discretion, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise the positive effects of retirement villages;</li> <li>• Focus effects assessments on exceedances of relevant standards, effects on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces, and effects arising from the quality of the interface between the village and adjacent streets or public open spaces to reflect the policy framework within the Enabling Housing Act. A degree of control over longer buildings is also acknowledged as appropriate; and</li> <li>• Enable the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to be taken into account when assessing effects.</li> </ul>	Retirement villages are different to typical residential dwellings, and therefore do not necessarily fit in with the typical controls imposed on residential developments. The Variation does include tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages through the reference to the retirement village policy. Opposes the matters of discretion set out under RESZ-P13 as they are broader than the matters relevant under the MDRS and they do not allow for consideration of the positive effects of retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. It is important that other rules do not render retirement villages discretionary or non-complying and therefore lose the benefit of clear and focused matters of discretion.
FS67.44	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 32-General > 32.3-Infrastructure

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS16.1	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	Developers should meet 100% of the costs of their development, including PCC-related infrastructure costs.	PCC should not levy existing ratepayers, or borrow to fund developer's contributions, or issue guarantees for developers so they can raise money to fund.
FS99.19	Alan Collett	Support	Allow	<p>Support all of the submission, do not want to see the cost of infrastructure shared with council. The developers are making a windfall out of some of this work and the profits should not be subsidized by public money.</p> <p>Documents released under OIA already show that developers and PCC have been planning these changes long before it was made public and their failed bid to the government's infrastructure handouts should not now be covered by the PCC rate payer.</p>
FS118.188	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as it considers financial/development contributions must recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.

OS16.2	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	<p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, required to install silt traps for all storm water and ground drainage. PCC to contract annual cleaning of silt traps, which is added to the annual rates of each property. Every 5th year, PCC or approved contractors, to test for integrity / additional and modified connections.</p> <p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, required to install storm water storage tanks of at least 500L, connected to each down pipe.</p> <p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, are not permitted to install external, mains connected taps. Only permitted external taps are those connected to storm water storage tanks and grey water storage tanks.</p> <p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, required to have metered water supply.</p> <p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, are permitted to connect toilet cisterns to storm water storage tanks and grey water storage tanks.</p>	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission, including attachment]
FS126.1	Grant Abdee	Not Stated	Not stated	<p>Support the submitter in having silt traps and silt trap inspections for any ground drainage (soak pits.)</p> <p>Oppose having soak pits where neighbouring properties are lower or downstream from the soak pit, or where the land is banked or sloped. Soak pit related run-off can result in soil slippage</p>

				<p>and erosion, particularly on steep terrain. Also, there is no water run-off protection for neighbouring properties or control of where the water run-off exits from the under soak pit.</p> <p>Pukerua Bay is sand/clay based and drainage is not straight forward. There is evidence of soil erosion and slips throughout the area.</p> <p>Where neighbouring properties are lower or downstream from the soak pit support having a water collecting tank and automatic transfer pump to storm water drain system or roadside.</p> <p>Support every 5th year, PCC, or approved contractors, test for integrity/additional and modified connections.</p> <p>It would be great if Council, or approved contractors, inspected all drainage systems and sewerage systems every 5 years to see if they are compliant.</p>
OS38.6	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Work closely with Waka Kotahi to make a more liveability-focused and climate-focused road and street network, especially where intensification is happening.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-</p>

				<p>being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adulthood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.
OS38.9	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Green spaces that are recreational, food producing, and support biodiversity. Community gardens and green stormwater infrastructure should maximise their value across all these outcomes and the District Plan should support the creation of a sustainable and resilient local food and biodiversity network system.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adulthood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p>

				<p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.10	Amos Mann	Not Stated	The new bicycle and micro-mobility device parking requirements for commercial and community facilities in the Centres and Mixed Use zones.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to</p>

				<p>teenage-hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
OS38.23	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel must be prioritised for access to public transport	So people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.
OS39.4	Madeleine Waters	Amend	In relation to High and Medium Density Residential Zones, seeks that the capacity of current services needs to be considered in all new developments.	<p>In the Submitter's street, when water is drawn in neighbouring Joseph Banks for rural property delivery, submitter loses water pressure and some houses lose their water supply completely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity is compromised at peak times.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services would not cope with household numbers increasing by 200% on each site (drains, electricity, fibre, water etc).</li> <li>• There is already a significant number of vehicles parked on the road outside each home, public transport is limited so vehicles are required, where will all the additional cars be parked? Submitter lives on a corner at the brow of the hill and had many near misses pulling out of their driveway due to visibility obscured by the increasing number of cars parked on the road.</li> </ul> <p>Can existing infrastructure cope with the new medium and high density zones?</p>
FS17.90	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS60.6	Rosie Gallagher	Not Stated	Universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel, must be prioritised for access to public transport.	So that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.
FS17.261	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.24	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Add rules to permit the development of appropriate zero carbon, public transport and active transport infrastructure.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy

				<p>CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>
FS17.349	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.52	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the rules.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new rules. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.
OS74.27	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend TR-S9 and/or TR-Table 6 to require EV or e-bike charging stations, including for residential development.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>

FS17.352	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.29	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend TR-Table 7 to provide for thresholds for when consent applicants must prepare travel 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.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.  In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.
FS17.354	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.53	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the rule.	Waka Kotahi supports the direction to District Councils to consider travel demand management plans to identify trip generation and provide opportunities to address Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT). Waka Kotahi also notes that Integrated Transport Assessments (ITA's) and Travel Demand Management Plans are two separate matters, and an ITA is not necessarily the best place in the district plan provisions for this to be included. Waka Kotahi supports the intent of this submission point, however, seeks to be

				involved in further discussions regarding the implementation of the submission point.
OS74.30	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Ensure that TR-R5 (3) includes a requirement that the travel demand management plan (integrated transport assessment) includes the measures to reduce reliance on private vehicles and encourage modal shift to low carbon, active or public transport options.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are: Policy CC.1, Policy CC.2, Policy CC.3, Policy CC.9, Policy CC.10, Policy 7, Policy 57, Policy 58.</p> <p>In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) so can be included in an IPI, and therefore is within scope of submissions. These provisions would assist in addressing effects associated with intensification.</p>
FS17.355	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.54	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the rule.	Waka Kotahi supports the direction to District Councils to consider travel demand management plans to identify trip generation and provide opportunities to address Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT). Waka Kotahi supports the intent of this submission point, however, seeks to be involved in further discussions regarding the implementation of the submission point.
OS74.35	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Permit the development of green infrastructure in appropriate locations and subject to necessary controls, i.e.,	Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate

			<p>planting works undertaken by regional council.</p>	<p>change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as 'actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change...'</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater</p>
--	--	--	---	---



				management under section 80(E).t-wide matter.
FS17.360	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.54	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	A policy that requires financial contributions to be paid where stormwater treatment and management is provided offsite under a Stormwater Management Plan.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy FW.4.  Financial contributions provisions are in scope of IPIs under RMA section 80E(1)(b)(i).
FS17.379	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS118.132	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Oppose in part.  Disallow submission point, or amend the relief sought to ensure a clear and proportionate financial contributions regime that prevents double dipping, provides clarity as to contributions payable, and provides a retirement-village specific regime that takes into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double-dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and that do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.

OS74.85	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <p>Rules to manage the provision of new, or additions or upgrades to transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development.</p> <p>The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy CC.11.</p> <p>In regard to scope, intensification could see changes in transport networks, and because infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d) it could be included in an IPI.</p>
FS17.410	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.55	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	Disallow	Waka Kotahi does not support the submission point as there are existing rules under the Infrastructure Chapter that manage the provision of new, or additions or upgrades to transport infrastructure.
OS74.86	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <p>Include a policy to encourage carbon emissions assessment for certain types of projects, or activities over a certain threshold, and specify what these assessments must include.</p>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development.</p> <p>The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy CC.11.</p> <p>In regard to scope, intensification could see changes in transport networks, and because infrastructure is a related matter under</p>

				RMA section 80E(2)(d) it could be included in an IPI.
FS17.411	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.56	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the policy.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the new policy. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.
OS79.7	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Concerns raised about the overall capacity and quality of infrastructure in our area and its ability to handle projected growth. Much of the existing infrastructure in established areas being rezoned to MRZ or HRZ is already in need of renewal and will not cope with the increased load that intensification will bring.
FS17.425	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.372	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS91.2	Russell Morrison	Not Stated	Submitter would like to see more surety from the PCC about how the existing wastewater system will be fixed by having its capacity enhanced and that no connections from the Plimmerton Farms or Pukerua Bay developments will be made to the system before that has been achieved.	Submitter has previously provided photographs showing manholes along Mana Esplanade discharging wastewater onto the footpath (and thence into the harbour) during heavy rain events, and the effects on our beaches and harbour waters. Despite past exercises in tracking down sources of stormwater infiltration, the situation has simply got worse For instance, a significant area of the footpath around

				<p>the manhole outside 72 Mana Esplanade has in recent years been lifted, pitted and frequently coated with toilet paper because of the pressure on the system – with the diluted sewage running into the Inlet at Pascoe Avenue causing contamination of the beach and harbour waters with bacteria and viruses contained in the wastewater. As this area is frequented by children and others playing in this water, significant public health risks are posed.</p> <p>Apart from these increasingly regular overflows, the submitter also understands that overflows from the emergency outlets because of problems at pump stations or breakages are not unusual.</p> <p>This is currently happening without the Plimmerton Farm and Pukerua Bay developments and without the additional growth associated with a potential Special Development Project (SDP) as well as the ongoing promotion of infill and intensified housing.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Report compiled by Envelope Engineering clearly states that “Wastewater discharge from the site could not connect to the existing public downstream reticulation without the current capacity issues being addressed” (and the same was said for the Plimmerton Farms development). But after discussing</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>flow mitigation options, the report then states that “There would be no requirement for Council to undertake immediate wholesale upgrades to the downstream reticulation system”.</p> <p>Based on past and present experience, the Submitter cannot have confidence that wastewater issues will be adequately provided for on the strength of such statements. Back in 2013, officer reports and correspondence with PCC’s Chief Executive (Gary Simpson) assured us that these problems would be relieved by activating the cross-harbour waste water line at Paremata within the 2013/14 year and/or installing sewer storage tanks at Dolly Varden by 2015/16.</p> <p>Neither has occurred and in June 2021 we were advised by Wellington Water that current planning for the design and construction of the Plimmerton-Mana-Camborne gravity sewer capacity increase project was to be between 2027/28 and 2031/32.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including photograph]</p>
FS17.466	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS91.4	Russell Morrison	Not Stated	Submitter would like to see an acknowledgement that the proposed	The Submitter's previous submission and presentation on the Plimmerton Farms

			<p>northern developments have the potential to generate significant extra traffic that is likely to have considerable adverse effects on the existing character and amenity of other communities (particularly Paremata); and ensuring that those effects are not overlooked in the scramble for new development in the north.</p>	<p>development outlined some of the history and background to this matter – including the community expectations associated with the completion of the Transmission Gully route (TGM) and concern that all the promised benefits would not eventuate if the effects of the developments were not recognised and addressed now.</p> <p>Since then, Waka Kotahi has decided not to honour a commitment by Transit NZ made to the local community before the Environment Court in 2001 to “to demolish the existing Paremata Bridge and remove the Clearways through Mana in conjunction with the opening of TGM”. Instead Waka Kotahi will be undertaking consultations over the next six months with various parties on a range of issues relating to how the current SH58 and SH59 should operate in future.</p> <p>The commitment was, in effect, an acknowledgement by Transit NZ that (a) the road would not remain in that form after TGM was completed because it could not meet desirable standards for such things as lane and footpath widths, noise, vibration and air quality levels, proximity to houses, etc. and (b) that the old bridge had a limited life and was likely to be having adverse impacts on the harbour.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Removal of the clearways and reversion to one lane in each direction was expected to have obvious safety benefits in allowing lane and footpath widths as well as parking and cycling space to be restored. Health benefits would also be significant with reductions in noise, vibration and air pollution levels.</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) produced by Tim Kelly Transportation Planning Ltd identifies one of the potential effects of the Pukerua Bay South variation as “the safety and efficiency of the wider SH59 corridor” and believes (page 16) that “even with measures to promote the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport, the use of private vehicles will be likely to remain the predominant mode of travel for residents to and from the Site for the foreseeable future”.</p> <p>The ITA also says (page 17) that the cumulative effect of Plimmerton Farms, Pukerua South and Muri Road Stage 1 developments (3590 dwellings in total) “has a potential to give rise to capacity issues within the local area road network” and concludes (page 35) that “the cumulative effect of the two developments (Plimmerton Farms and Pukerua Bay South) could result in traffic volumes in parts of the SH59 corridor returning towards, or even above, the levels experienced prior to the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>opening of the Transmission Gully project – this may affect the ability to ‘detune’ this route and may not be anticipated by residents enjoying the current levels of reduced traffic activity.” The report does mention on page 26 a need to demonstrate (at the time that specific development proposals are brought forward) that there will not be any significant adverse effects associated with the additional traffic activity upon the wider network.</p> <p>Submitter would suggest, however, that the potential for such high traffic levels and what measures need to be taken should be being discussed now – not at that late stage. There seems no reason to dishonour previous commitments at this stage but we need to acknowledge that the road (and the management of it) is not fit-for-purpose at present and to identify what changes will be needed to make it acceptable in the future. In the meantime it is important to ensure that the communities will not continue to be further affected by having to put up with sub-standard roads or increased community severance. (It may, for instance, be desirable now to be increasing setbacks for new buildings on Mana Esplanade to allow for future roading standards to be met.)</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
--	--	--	--	--



FS17.468	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS102.1	James Hadley Bond	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Not opposed to intensification within Porirua City but has concerns that mitigation for all potential failures/overloading of infrastructure will not be fully addressed, in an effort to reduce the cost of and speed up development.</p> <p>The wastewater plant is already operating beyond capacity unless it has been or is about to be modified. It is incapable of dealing with the enormous volume of infiltrating storm water. Another plant needs to be built and infiltration needs to be addressed urgently, even without residential and commercial intensification. The question then is where could a new plant be built? The existing plant was built with the planned prospect of duplication on it's western side. Also if a different site is chosen, where will the effluent be discharged?</p>
FS17.492	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS102.2	James Hadley Bond	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Not opposed to intensification within Porirua City but has concerns that mitigation for all potential failures/overloading of infrastructure will not be fully addressed, in an effort to

				<p>reduce the cost of and speed up development.</p> <p>The existing main wastewater pump stations (City Centre and Tangare Drive) are currently incapable of coping during even moderate storms (again due to unaddressed stormwater infiltration) and are unlikely to be able to cope with dry weather flows from intensification. A lack of understanding of the total system is demonstrated by the current replacement of the trunk sewer through Bothamley Park without considering the volume of stormwater entering the system from housing above the park. Manholes are surcharging during moderate storms. The lack of capacity at the City Centre pump station which cannot cope causes a substantial discharge of wastewater into the Porirua Stream. Tanagre Drive Pump Station has perhaps a little more capacity. Suggests a solution could be to run a new line across the harbour from Whitford Brown to Tangare Drive so that this flow would bypass the City Centre, but this would mean a battle with Greater Wellington Regional Council. Another solution would be to use the existing line form Paremata Train Station to Onepoto (refurbished) and rearrange the valving at Onepoto and Tangare Drive to send the flow through the Tangare Drive pump</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				station rather than the Onepoto pump station.
FS17.493	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS102.3	James Hadley Bond	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Not opposed to intensification within Porirua City but has concerns that mitigation for all potential failures/overloading of infrastructure will not be fully addressed, in an effort to reduce the cost of and speed up development.</p> <p>The discharge of stormwater. With the increase of roofing, paving and roading reducing the available land area for absorption of rain water, where will the collected water be allowed to exit? Will it add to the existing flood risk? Will it reduce the stability of the soils? Will it overflush existing waterways?</p>
FS17.494	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS102.4	James Hadley Bond	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Not opposed to intensification within Porirua City but has concerns that mitigation for all potential failures/overloading of infrastructure will not be fully addressed, in an effort to reduce the cost of and speed up development.

				The increased demand for potable water. Production of potable water in the Wellington region is almost at capacity now.
FS17.495	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS104.9	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Traffic congestion and parking effects viewed as an interim contributor to traffic calming and safer streets, and used tactically as such.	The increased density of cars parked in streets, and traffic congestion, can be a helpful contributor to traffic calming and safer streets by slowing down traffic, discouraging rat-running, and adding an extra nudge for those "on the fence" to maybe travel another way for those short trips. This is really important to help shift habits as we all go on the journey to properly-configured streets that support our neighbourhoods.
FS17.505	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS104.10	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Make transport and landuse work in synergy Seeks changes to council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems and so forth that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]

FS17.506	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS104.11	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	Universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel prioritised for access to public transport.	So that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.
FS17.507	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS111.1	Pukerua Bay School BOT	Not Stated	<p>That this development and variation pre-plans with the Ministry of Education to either bolster the infrastructure of Pukerua Bay School to ensure the buildings and space can handle the increasing numbers of children into the area, while still maintaining the open field environment for the benefit of the children and teachers at the school, and community.</p> <p>And Or</p> <p>Get confirmation from the Ministry of Education of a new school in the area and robust plans and timeframes for this to occur.</p>	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to Consideration of the school.</p> <p>There is no comment or visible consideration of Pukerua Bay School and the impact the development or variation will have on the school. When questions have been asked the standard response has been the Ministry of Education will be looking into this. However, there does not appear to be any evidence of pre-planning, which suggests a reactionary approach will likely be taken. One concern is that, as a result of the variation and development, enrolments at Pukerua Bay School will increase, which will see the need for temporary/portacom style classrooms to be used to accommodate the extra children. As has happened in some nearby schools with significant population growth, such as Papakowhai School, our concern is that these temporary structures will gradually fill up our school field and lessen the greenspace of the school, which will limit the range of outdoor activities offered to</p>

				<p>the children of the school and community, and ultimately impact negatively on the education and achievement of the children. The temporary arrangements will also add to the existing flooding/drainage issues on the school field too.</p> <p>The Ministry of Educations works on 36 additional children per 100 houses that are built, so there will be significant pressure put on the infrastructure of the school and access from areas from homes to the school.</p>
FS17.523	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.495	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Impacts on education as well as the new recreation provisions need to be noted.
OS111.4	Pukerua Bay School BOT	Not Stated	That careful planning and management of Muri Road and the surrounding roads be undertaken for this project such as creating a clear division on the road for pedestrians, and/or having no vehicle movement one hour prior to school or one hour after school.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to pathways and movement.</p> <p>Currently children can walk to and from school from all Pukerua Bay locations, and biking access is similar. The development and variation does not include a lot of detail about road design and the School is concerned about the safety of children when they walk or bike to school with these changes, and in particular during the development phase. They have children who live on Muri Road and in the surrounding areas so are concerned about the increased traffic flow up and down this road by heavy vehicles and construction</p>

				<p>vehicles. They understand it is anticipated that much of the in and out traffic will be via the SH59 connection, but there will obviously be a lot of up and down on Muri Road also throughout different stages of this project. Parts of Muri Road has no footpath and it is single lane in some areas, which will make this a high risk zone for their students during and following this development project.</p> <p>Would also like their students to be able to get to and from school without needing a parent to drive them. Some of the proposed development is quite far away from the school and not within walking distance for children. Some type of public transport would be ideal to ferry the children in the eastern most areas of the new development to and from the school.</p>
FS17.526	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.498	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Impacts on education as well as the new recreation provisions need to be noted.
OS111.5	Pukerua Bay School BOT	Not Stated	Provide a public transport link so those children in the eastern most areas who are out of walking distance have a safe way to get to and from school.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to pathways and movement.</p> <p>Currently children can walk to and from school from all Pukerua Bay locations, and biking access is similar. The development and variation does not include a lot of detail about road design and the School is concerned about the safety of children</p>

				<p>when they walk or bike to school with these changes, and in particular during the development phase. They have children who live on Muri Road and in the surrounding areas so are concerned about the increased traffic flow up and down this road by heavy vehicles and construction vehicles. They understand it is anticipated that much of the in and out traffic will be via the SH59 connection, but there will obviously be a lot of up and down on Muri Road also throughout different stages of this project. Parts of Muri Road has no footpath and it is single lane in some areas, which will make this a high risk zone for their students during and following this development project.</p> <p>Would also like their students to be able to get to and from school without needing a parent to drive them. Some of the proposed development is quite far away from the school and not within walking distance for children. Some type of public transport would be ideal to ferry the children in the eastern most areas of the new development to and from the school.</p>
FS17.527	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.499	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Impacts on education as well as the new recreation provisions need to be noted.
OS112.1	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks to have protections in place for their electricity distribution network in	To ensure that any infrastructure issues are considered should anyone apply for a land



			consideration of intensified urban development in close proximity to key substation sites.	use consent for any high or medium density housing proposal.
OS112.2	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks to ensure protection of existing and lawfully established key substation site 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 be brought about through PC19 and VA1, and which will significantly increase the intensity of sensitive land use in close proximity to established substation facilities.
OS112.3	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks to ensure that the key substation sites of the Porirua Substation and the Waitangirua Substation will not be unreasonably constrained through housing intensification on abutting residential land, and furthermore, that any such intensification will not result in the creation or exacerbation of Reverse Sensitivity effects.	The Porirua Substation and the Waitangirua Substation are examples of lawfully established activities. Intensifying sensitive residential land use on properties abutting these substation sites will increase the risk of reverse sensitivity – unless adequate provisions in PC19 and VA1 are provided.
OS112.4	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks to have future residential intensification north and south of the site reflect the established operation of the critical distribution facility.	Submitter owns and operates facilities in other intensification areas within the City which abut residential zones subject to PC19 and VA1 and consequently proposed to be subject to intensification provisions. Seeks to raise Council's awareness of the Waitangirua Zone Substation and also seeks to have future residential intensification north and south of the site reflect the established operation of the critical distribution facility. The Waitangirua Zone Substation is located in a residential setting on 7 Waihemo Street, Waitangirua in Porirua and is supplied by two 33kV feeders. The Site contains two indoor 33/11

				kV, 20 MVA transformers, each supplying an 11kV, 1,200 A bus section. Whilst the Waitangirua substation is not identified as a High Density Residential Zone under VA1, it falls under the Medium Density Residential Zone whereby 3 level residential units could be established as close as 1.0 m from the facility's electrical distribution compound as a permitted activity.
OS112.12	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated		
FS76.403	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes 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.

## 32-General > 32.5-Commercial Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS17.1	Leigh Subritzky	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission].	<p>Feedback on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Revision of all commercial zones to enable taller buildings and increased housing in commercial areas.</li> <li>6. Replacement of the City Centre zone with the Metropolitan centre zone.</li> <li>7. Revised urban design guides for all residential and commercial zones.</li> <li>8. New maps showing the location of all new and revised zones, intensification precincts, and qualifying matters.</li> </ul>

				<p>The submitter is in favour of the topics raised in lieu of a bulldozer demolishing the city centre and starting again. Believes that in order to bring people back to the tumbleweed city centre, housing should be encouraged here. More housing in the city centre should be investigated instead of exciting neighbourhoods and Plimmerton Farms. Commercial areas such as Epsdon should be investigated but other commercial areas in the CBD should not be considered.</p> <p>The submitter concludes that they are in favour of housing in the city centre and some commercial areas. PCC has a responsibility to protect the land, people, flora and fauna over money.</p>
FS17.36	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.10	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	<p>Provide provisions and spatial application for Town Centre Zone in the Plan (as shown in submitter's attached appendices).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.678	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.98	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns

				with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS75.71	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.43	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.17	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.28	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Centres – generally better reflect design flexibility, planned urban built form, development density and height/daylight expectations.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul>

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.696	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.53	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.61	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS127.35	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.34	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Introduce a new Commercial – Town Centre Zone in the Plan for Mana.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>



FS17.702	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS74.99	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	Whole – seek to retain Mana zoning as notified.	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's request to rezone Mana as Town Centre Zone. The National Planning Standards describe a Town Centre Zone as areas used predominantly in smaller urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities and in larger urban areas, a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. A Local Centre Zone is described as Areas used predominantly for a range of commercial and community activities that service the needs of the residential catchment. The area identified by the submitter to be rezoned more accurately fits the description for local centre zoning which is the current proposed zoning in the Proposed District Plan. This better aligns with the other local centre zoned areas in the Porirua District which include Waitangirua Mall, Cannons Creek, Whitby and Titahi Bay, and has regard to the identified hierarchy in Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS75.47	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua

			the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.	city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.67	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.41	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.35	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Introduce a 40m height limit [for Town Centre Zone at Mana]	To recognise the broader catchment this centre serves, both currently and to account for future growth of the residential catchment.

FS17.703	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.68	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.42	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS118.48	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that fit for purpose retirement village planning provisions are applied in appropriate commercial and mixed-use zones, similar to those proposed for residential zones.	Commercial and mixed use zones enable mixed uses, including residential activities, and may contain suitable sites for retirement villages. In order to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSUD, Variation 1 must provide for intensification in these zones. Supports restricted discretionary activity status for retirement villages where it is

				provided in the Local Centre, Mixed Use and Metropolitan Centre Zones. Restricted discretionary activity status is sought in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and the Large Format Retail Zone as well.
FS67.50	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 32-General > 32.6-National Policy Statement for Urban Development

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS81.2	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Supports the intent and content of the NPS-UD. This recognises the national significance of having well-functioning urban environments that enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The NPS-UD has a strong focus on ensuring that increased densities are provided in the most accessible parts of urban areas, where communities are able to access jobs, services and recreation by active and public transport modes.</p> <p>Supports the requirements of the RMA-EHS. It seeks the full implementation of these requirements, including the introduction of the MDRS and related provisions in eligible zones. These standards should only be modified to accommodate qualifying matters, and should be modified only to the</p>

				extent required to accommodate these matters. Qualifying matters should be supported by a strong evidence base to ensure a robust application.
FS17.1036	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.390	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Allow	Kāinga Ora supports this submission, to the extent that it is consistent with Kāinga Ora's primary submission

## 32-General > 32.8-Design Guides

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS38.1	Amos Mann	Not Stated	Accessibility and Universal Design requirements in the Design Guides and in incentives.	<p>The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including Papakāinga and Co-housing.</p> <p>More then ever before we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We are in an exciting transformative time discovering what works best for our people, our well-being, our climate, our environment, and our wealth as we go. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.</p> <p>At this time, our community members have a wide and expanding range of needs across their life-stories: from childhood, to teenage-</p>

				<p>hood, to student-hood, to adult-hood, and into old age and retirement, we each have a tremendous range of different community needs, environment needs, transportation needs, well being needs, and wealth creation needs. Housing solutions that are flexible enough to meet these needs look nothing like those from over the past 50 years.</p> <p>We must not continue to work harder and harder to try and meet the needs of only a very few people and only for a relatively short period of their lives. We must be accountable to the diverse and many throughout their life-stories.</p> <p>We need the District Plan to support the change that is happening now, to be flexible and open enough to promote the change that we are faced with - it's no longer a choice whether our housing will change, it must change and it will change.</p>
FS99.21	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks the whole submission be disallowed. .	<p>Oppose the complete submission. Ideology driven. No basis of evidence or fact. Democracy dictates what I choose and how I choose to house myself</p>
OS39.3	Madeleine Waters	Amend	<p>In relation to High and Medium Density Residential Zones, seeks that well thought out Design Guidelines are needed to ensure the medium and high density developments in Porirua:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are of a high quality</li> <li>• Are sympathetic to people's physical and mental health needs</li> </ul>	<p>This is essential to ensure developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are not future slums that resemble Communist apartment buildings in Eastern Europe</li> <li>• Avoid housing people in small, poorly laid out boxes (visit some of the new apartment developments in Wellington that are sold off the</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are designed to be well laid out, aesthetically pleasing, fit for people to live in</li> </ul>	<p>plan for guidance on what not to allow)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People are paying \$1m+ for tiny apartments that are badly designed with literally no space to put a sofa (quality design is crucial to protect people who buy off the plan)</li> </ul>
FS17.89	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.4	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Delete references to Design Guides across the plan and update provisions to reflect design outcomes. External design guides to be referenced as a guidance note.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required</li> </ul>

				<p>under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.672	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.77	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.37	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is



				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.206	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part and requests submission point be allowed in part. The RVA seeks for this request to be allowed with respect to the removal of Design Guidelines from the Plan.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point in part, noting that the Design Guidelines do not provide for / recognise the individual functional and operational needs of retirement villages. However, it opposes the use of Design Guidelines as a non-statutory tool in the Plan provisions.
FS127.11	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.5	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	In the alternative, design guidance is streamlined and simplified.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for</li> </ul>

				<p>decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.673	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.76	Roger Gadd	Oppose	<p>Submitter seeks that the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.38	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.207	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part and requests submission point be allowed in part. The RVA seeks for this request to be allowed with respect to the removal of Design Guidelines from the Plan.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point in part, noting that the Design Guidelines do not provide for / recognise the individual functional and operational needs of retirement villages. However, it opposes the use of Design Guidelines as a non-statutory tool in the Plan provisions.
FS127.12	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.6	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Seeks the design guides are guidance that is provided outside of the Plan and can be updated on best practice without the need to undertake a Schedule 1 of the RMA process every time it needs to be updated.	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered</li> </ul>

				<p>other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.674	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.75	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.39	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has

			proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.141	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part and allows in part. The RVA seeks for this request to be allowed with respect to the removal of Design Guidelines from the Plan.	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point in part, noting that the Design Guidelines do not provide for / recognise the individual functional and operational needs of retirement villages. However, it opposes the use of Design Guidelines as a non-statutory tool in the Plan provisions.
FS127.13	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.46	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	All Design Guides are deleted [from the District Plan].	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.714	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.36	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.79	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may

			for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.53	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.65	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Seeks the Design Guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. A note should be added where reference is made to such guidelines:  <i>Note:</i>  <u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u>	Considers that the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with.  Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.  Alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design

				<p>outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.733	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.98	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is



				nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.72	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.66	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Delete all references to the Design Guidelines and in any requirement to meet or follow the Design Guidelines in the provisions and PDP.	<p>Considers that the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with.</p> <p>Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be</p>

				<p>achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.734	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.99	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.73	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.

OS76.69	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines [design guides] if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>	<p>Considers that the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan act as de facto rules to be complied with.</p> <p>Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
---------	------------------------------------	--------	---	---

FS17.737	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.102	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.76	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.350	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Seeks the Design Guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. A note should be added where reference is made to such guidelines:  <i>Note:</i>	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports

			<p><u><i>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</i></u></p> <p>-</p>	<p>the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment. Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.1018	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.383	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to

				one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.198	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in these submission points (amendments to the Design Guides) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.357	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.351	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Delete all references to the Design Guidelines.	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.

				<p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.1019	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.384	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people

FS118.199	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in these submission points (amendments to the Design Guides) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.358	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.352	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>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>Optimise the quality of the built form outcome with an integrated, comprehensive design approach to the site.</u></li> <li>ii. <u>Achieve visual interest while also achieving aesthetic coherence and integration.</u></li> <li>iii. <u>Achieve driveways, manoeuvring and parking areas that are safe, convenient, and attractive.</u></li> <li>iv. <u>Integrate building form and open space design to achieve high internal amenity and form well-located and usable private open spaces.</u></li> </ul>	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with.</p> <p>Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. <u>Achieve reasonable sunlight, daylight, and outlook.</u></li> <li>vi. <u>Provide reasonable internal visual privacy for all units within a development.</u></li> <li>vii. <u>Ensure outdoor living areas are well-located, functional for the intended use, and high quality.</u></li> <li>viii. <u>Achieve visual amenity, safety, and functionality with planting.</u></li> <li>ix. <u>Achieve high quality, legible and efficient circulation.</u></li> <li>x. <u>Provide for servicing that is suitably generous, convenient, and visually discreet.</u></li> </ul>	<p>achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment. Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.1020	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.385	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire

				central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.200	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in these submission points (amendments to the Design Guides) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.359	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.353	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	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.	Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment

				<p>criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.</p>
FS17.1021	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.386	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.201	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in these submission points (amendments to the Design Guides) as it is

				inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.360	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.354	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Seek the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.	<p>Opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with.</p> <p>Opposes any policy or rule that requires development proposals to be consistent with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and residential development in commercial centres (city, metro, etc) sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the</p>

				relief sought.
FS17.1022	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.387	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.202	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in these submission points (amendments to the Design Guides) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.361	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the

				request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS79.3	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Support	The use of the Residential Design Guide.	Concerned if use of a clear, enforceable Design Guide was not in place against a background of increased intensification in both existing residential areas and on greenfields sites.
FS17.421	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.368	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.

## 32-General > 32.9-Section 32 Evaluation Report

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS41.2	Helga Sheppard	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Raises comments/concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three - six storey dwellings being out of character with area.</li> <li>• Appears to be no mention of recourse for land owners if natural enjoyment of properties is impacted.</li> <li>• Could not establish in section 32 report if there were environmental assessments for Titahi Bay of the impact from high density dwellings on affected areas. Also whether any current assessments were peer-reviewed to confirm findings.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has restored garden so it is organic, and resulting in increased birdlife.</li> <li>• Loss of sunlight if third-storey dwellings erected on surrounding properties (loss of all sunlight from north). This would result in having to remove trees, which would impact on bird and insect life, drainage issues, and affect the character of their property including privacy.</li> <li>• Infrastructure issues: from high-density dwellings; previous discharges into Titahi Bay, whether there has been an assessment/plan to consider impacts of proposed plan change and variation on existing infrastructure, concerns with rates, and exacerbating an existing bad situation.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.95	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS53.24	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the Section 32 Evaluation and reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter.	Although not forming part of the IPI, supports reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter within the Section 32, Part A. It is noted that the National Grid Yard provisions not only amend the height standards but also density.
FS17.635	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS83.15	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>The section 32 analysis relies heavily on the Housing and Business Capacity Assessments, which have fundamentally flawed logic. They fail to envisage the “missing middle” housing typologies and their role in Porirua, asserting without any evidence base that Porirua people will, overwhelmingly, only ever want to live in detached homes so this is what must be enabled by greenfield expansion.</p> <p>The HCBA and the Retail Assessment also assume a failure by Porirua city and all the councils of the region to meet emissions reduction targets by reducing VKT. Such an approach to growth creates a neat self-fulfilling prophecy by ensuring that greenfield expansions will simply create more dormitory-plus suburbs where people are forced to drive to do the most basic activities of daily life.</p> <p>A vast number of the constraints on the good activities that give density done well, and the 15-minute city experience, are predicated on the same thing: the fact that they are assumed to generate traffic effects and parking effects. This District Plan speaks to a profound belief that Porirua citizens can never drive substantially less than we currently do, and speaks to a deep fear of the consequences of “traffic and parking effects”. This belief and this fear is pervasively baked into the PDP.</p>
---------	-----------------------	------------	---	--



				<p>Yet we know, from all the relentless evidence of more mature cities, that more and better density, more amenities in existing places, and more people living within walking / scooting / biking distance of those places, will simply obviate those traffic related issues. It will also give Porirua people a fighting chance of reducing our emissions, having safer and more child-friendly streets for active travel and for our children and older people to enjoy a full life in Porirua.</p> <p>That “compact and liveable city” and “connected and active city” stuff in our Growth Strategy.</p>
FS17.1100	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 32-General > 32.10-Notification preclusion

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS85.7	Metlifecare Limited	Support	That the rule [for building/structure in the residential zones]] is precluded from being publicly notified.	The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to

				<p>satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.444	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.44	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Limited notification should only be available where a retirement village application breaches one or more of the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards and the relevant RMA effects threshold is met.	A key consenting issue for retirement village operators across the country relates to the delays, costs and uncertainties associated with notification processes. Consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act, applications for retirement villages in the relevant residential zones should not be publicly notified based on density effects. In addition, limited notification should only be used where a retirement village application proposes a breach of a relevant density standard that manages external amenity effects and the relevant effects threshold in the RMA is met. It is noted that the Variation precludes public notification of retirement villages (HRZ-R19 and MRZ-R22). However, limited notification is available where the relevant RMA effects threshold is met.
FS67.46	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

## 32-General > 32.11-Significant Natural Areas

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS74.41	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a policy to direct the circumstances when and how biodiversity offsetting can be used and if used, the outcome must be at least a 10 percent biodiversity gain or benefit. Refer to an appendix for full details.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy 24 and Policy 47.</p> <p>In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which can be considered in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a qualifying matter under section 80(E)(2)(e).</p>
FS17.366	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.47	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow part 41 of OS74	<p>Support a policy on when and how biodiversity offsetting can be used and if used the outcome must be at least a 10 percent bioversity gain or benefit.</p> <p>Degradation of the environment district-wide must stop. Promises of improvements to biodiversity must be iron-clad in future. This is particularly true where damage from development can only be mitigated through offsetting. Given that offsetting takes years to achieve there must be a net positive gain to make such offsetting worthwhile. A neutral end result</p>

				with negative results on the way to the gain is unacceptable in our view.
OS74.42	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include an appendix which sets out the limitations where biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate as described in Policy 24 and Appendix 1A.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy 24 and Policy 47.</p> <p>In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which can be considered in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a qualifying matter under section 80(E)(2)(e).</p>
FS17.367	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.43	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include an objective that mana whenua values relating to indigenous biodiversity are recognised and involvement in decision making and management is supported.	<p>Greater Wellington considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.</p> <p>In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral</p>

				lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).
FS17.368	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.44	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include policy that requires mana whenua involvement in the mapping of indigenous biodiversity, including to identify taonga species.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.  In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).
FS17.369	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.45	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include policy to enable mana whenua to undertake customary activities in accordance with tikanga such as customary harvest of mahinga kai species.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.

				In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).
FS17.370	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS114.60	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	We seek that this part of the submission requesting inclusion of a policy that enables mana whenua to undertake customary activities including cultural harvesting to be allowed.	Suggested addition of policy will provide for mana whenua to sustain mātauranga and build our skills regarding customary activities.
OS74.46	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include policy to support provision of access to indigenous biodiversity sites.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.  In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).
FS17.371	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS74.47	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include permitted activity rules for the cultural harvesting of mahinga kai, for example indigenous vegetation removal.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.</p> <p>In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).</p>
FS17.372	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS114.61	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	We seek that this part of the submission requesting inclusion of a policy that enables mana whenua to undertake customary activities including cultural harvesting to be allowed.	Suggested addition of policy will provide for mana whenua to sustain mātauranga and build our skills regarding customary activities.
OS74.48	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.</p> <p>In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a).</p>

				Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).
FS17.373	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.49	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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.	Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy IE.1 and Policy IE.2.  In regard to scope, indigenous ecosystems are considered a district-wide matter which are in scope of IPI under section 80E(2)(a). Additionally, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with ancestral lands and taonga is a qualifying matter under s80(E)(2)(e).
FS17.374	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.60	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include a new qualifying matter to Variation 1, to modify the MDRS on sites adjacent to SNAs. Possible drafting is included as follows:  "ECO-P13 - Height controls on sites surrounding Significant Natural Areas Limit the height and/or height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on	Submitter supports the inclusion of new SNAs in the NGA and considers that the potential effects of intensification activities within SNAs can be managed by the relevant overlay provisions.  However, Submitter is concerned about the potential effects of intensification activities on areas adjacent to SNAs, such as



			<p>sites identified on the planning maps as 'XX - Sites surrounding Significant Natural Areas' to ensure that the values of Significant Natural Areas in SCHED7 - Significant Natural Areas are protected."</p> <p>"ECO-P14 - Increased height and/or height in relation to boundary on sites surrounding Significant Natural Areas Only allow an increase in height and/or height in relation to boundary of buildings and structures on sites identified on the planning maps as 'XX - Sites surrounding Significant Natural Areas' where it can be demonstrated that the values of the Significant Natural Areas in SCHED7 - Significant Natural Areas will be protected."</p> <p>Amend the planning maps, so that Policies ECO-P13 and ECO-P14 apply to sites (properties) adjacent to SNAs</p>	<p>ecological corridors and buffer areas, and considers that the District Plan must manage these effects. These areas contribute to the long-term viability and enhancement of SNAs themselves through natural processes, e.g. seed dispersal.</p> <p>Submitter supports the approach taken by PCC to include a new qualifying matter as part of Variation 1, in regard to setbacks for buildings and structures adjacent to sites and areas of significance to Māori (see SASM-P9 and SASM-P10), and requests a similar buffer zone approach be provided for sites adjacent to SNAs. This approach gives effect to Policy 47(a) and (b) of the Operative RPS.</p> <p>In regard to scope, Submitter notes that given the request would be considered a new qualifying matter, to ensure the relevant RPS Policies are given effect to in Variation 1 and therefore it should be considered as in scope.</p>
FS17.385	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.385	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of a new qualifying matter to Variation 1, to modify the MDRS on sites adjacent to SNAs, and considers that the proposed framework managing effects upon identified SNA within the PDP is adequate. MDRS standards should only be modified to

				accommodate qualifying matters and should be modified only to the extent required to accommodate these matters. Kainga Ora does not consider the relief sought is appropriate.
OS79.2	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Support	The retention of SNAs to protect significant natural areas	There are a number of significant SNAs in the Plimmerton Camborne area and the Submitter believes all of them to be contributors to the general aesthetic and environmental values of the area. As well as protecting the habitat of native flora and fauna, they are necessary to maintain protection of land that is vulnerable to degradation from heavy rainfall or subject to flooding, subsidence, rising seas etc. With the prospect of future intensification and consequent reduction in garden space, SNAs are an important tool to identify and preserve the natural environment.
FS17.420	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.89	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all of part 2 of OS79	Support the retention of SNAs to protect significant natural areas. SNAs are an important tool to identify and preserve the natural environment. PCC has previously done extensive work to put in place SNAs not just in Plimmerton and Camborne but throughout the city. It would be a backward step to allow building within areas already designated SNAs
FS127.367	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.

## 32-General > 32.13-Hazards and Risks

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.3	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	[The identified matters] need to be considered when any medium or higher density developments are proposed.	<p>The higher density proposals in Variation 1 pose considerable risks to properties, hillside stability, and transport systems. These proposals also risk excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems and particularly risk damaging the sensitive environment of Te Awarua-o-Porirua.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. North and northwest facing hillsides such as those in the Paremata area are, with reasonable frequency, visited by high winds. Any large buildings will potentially create areas where the wind is accelerated, particularly by high buildings. These impacts should be the subject of research before any such building is allowed. The impacts will not just affect the large/high buildings and lots, but also surrounding properties. Rain will also be more forcefully driven into the hillsides increasing the erosion potential and thus sedimentation and contaminant flows into the harbour.</li> <li>2. Many of Porirua’s hillsides are unstable. This problem is made worse should steep sided</li> </ol>

				<p>excavations be made to accommodate high rise buildings. Excavation slopes should be limited to no more than 45 degrees. That would allow the slopes to better support the weight of higher parts of the hillsides, allow better and deeper-rooted vegetation to thrive and provide more opportunity for water to be absorbed and released progressively. Careful consideration should be given to potential hillside erosion.</p> <p>3. There is already significant development of the hillsides. These developments are supported by retaining walls of various types. Potentially undermining these walls with downhill excavations could have disastrous consequences for the existing retaining walls. All developments should be closely vetted for possible impacts on stability of higher retaining walls.</p> <p>Porirua City has developed proposals in this Variation 1 that will help reduce some of the above adverse consequences, but we consider Variation 1 needs further amendments to lower the risk to water bodies and Te Awarua-o-Porirua.</p>
FS17.57	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS127.454	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.
OS37.3	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Amend	Include liquefaction hazards in the Natural Hazards section and implement rules in the Natural Hazards, Subdivision, and Infrastructure chapters to restrict development in areas at high risk.	<p>Some areas of Porirua are at high risk of liquefaction in the event of an earthquake, which can be seen in the Greater Wellington Regional Council Liquefaction Hazard Map. One of these areas overlaps with an area which has been rezoned for high density residential development. Another overlaps with an area which has been rezoned for medium density residential development [see attached appendix – Figure 1].</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that certain building types are more susceptible to damage by liquefaction. Increased floor size and height and an irregular footprint increase the risk of liquefaction damage. Severe liquefaction under the foundations of a building during an earthquake can cause it to become uninhabitable and require complete rebuilding, even if the building does not suffer shaking damage. This leads to deconstruction waste and loss of embedded carbon, reconstruction waste and resource, and reduced wellbeing of those waiting for their house to be deconstructed and rebuilt. Buildings of up to 22 m tall are allowed in the High-density Residential Zone, which are at increased risk in a high liquefaction risk area. These higher rise buildings may accommodate many families who then need to be</p>

				<p>relocated during any deconstruction and reconstruction process.</p> <p>While foundation types as specified in the Building Act can reduce damage from liquefaction, it is important to also reduce risk by appropriate zoning. Property damage and associated disruption to life and wellbeing can be further reduced by avoiding intensification in areas at high risk of liquefaction. MBIE/MfE guidance is available on including liquefaction in land use planning, and submitter recommends this is used as a basis for developing policy for development in liquefaction susceptible areas.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS76.360	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	<p>Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing effects from natural hazards but opposes this submission seeking inclusion of liquefaction hazard maps and associated provisions. Kāinga Ora considers that if the evidence supports a managed approach to this hazard, then this should be a matter considered outside of the IPI process.</p>
FS123.3	Heriot Drive Ltd	Support	<p>Allow in part. Seeks that the planning maps be amended to identify known areas of high risk of slope failure.</p> <p>Disallow in part. Seeks that the policies and rules associated with the identification of areas of high risk of slope failure do not prohibit or preclude development as</p>	<p>Support the identification on planning maps of areas of high risk of slope failure.</p> <p>The EQC submission OS37.3 is entirely consistent with submissions made by Heriot Drive Ltd (Submission 156) and Raiha Properties Ltd (Submission 157) to the proposed Porirua District Plan (PDP). Those</p>

			<p>submission OS37.3 seems to seek, Rather the policies and rules should provide a trigger that geotechnical advice must be obtained and those recommendations implemented as a condition of approval. Unlike earthquake rupture, which cannot be avoided, the risk of slope failure can be mitigated and remedied and policies and rules should recognize that.</p>	<p>submissions stated:  “we seek that a more holistic approach be taken to addressing the risk to buildings and property from seismic events including liquefaction, slope failure and ground shaking rather than the single focus on fault rupture.”</p>
OS37.5	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Amend	<p>Include landslide hazards in the Natural Hazards section and implement rules in the Natural Hazards, Subdivision, and Infrastructure chapters to restrict development in areas at high risk.</p>	<p>Porirua is at risk of landslides, due to the high rainfall, earthquake risk, and high density of slopes steeper than 20°. The Porirua Proposed District Plan only considers slope instability in rules for earthworks, restricting earthworks on slopes greater than 34°, and limiting heights of earthworks. This does not consider the effect that underlying soil type, ground water level, and previous earthworks has on the likelihood of slope failure. Applying a Landslide Hazard overlay and restricting development within high-hazard areas will preclude inconsistent application of earthworks rules and prevent subdivision and development on slopes prone to failure. It is important to take this hazard into account when planning intensification and development projects to reduce the future risk to life, property and wellbeing.</p>
FS74.92	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	<p>Greater Wellington seek additional controls on landslide hazards to manage landslide risk on steep land. Greater Wellington considers that some controls should apply to slopes from ~20-34° instead of just above</p>	<p>Greater Wellington support the submitter’s request for additional provisions to control development on land that is at higher risk of slope failure. By identifying and managing this risk, the risk to life property and</p>

			34°. The matters of control for these areas should include a site-specific geotechnical investigation to ensure slope failure hazards are appropriately managed.	wellbeing of future urban intensification can be appropriately minimised. These changes would have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy 51.
FS76.362	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing effects from natural hazards, but opposes this submission seeking inclusion of landslide hazard overlay in the planning maps and associated provisions. Kāinga Ora considers that if the evidence supports a managed approach to this hazard, then this should be a matter considered outside of the IPI process.
OS74.34	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:</p> <p>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>Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as 'actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....'</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing</p>



				<p>naturebased solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).</p>
FS17.359	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.57	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amendments to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies 29, 51 and 52 and Objectives 19 and 20, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use 'minimise' instead of 'reduce' when referring to risks from natural hazards.</li> <li>• Consider the exacerbating effects of climate change and sea level rise.</li> <li>• Prioritise nature-based solutions, including soft engineering and, green infrastructure, room for the river, or mātauranga Māori options over hard engineering methods where possible. Minimise the impact of hard engineering</li> </ul>	<p>Submitter supports the risk-based approach to natural hazards taken by the PDP and the NGA, and existing encouragement of soft engineering measures in NH-P10.</p> <p>Submitter considers there is a role for amendments to some provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy 29, Policy 51 and Policy 52.</p> <p>In regard to scope, the management of natural hazard risks may be considered within the scope of the IPI as a related</p>

			methods on the natural environment where they are necessary.	provision through infrastructure under section 80(E).
FS17.382	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.48	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Submitter acknowledges the increasing impacts of climate change and the need to factor solutions into Council policies and rules. Submitter supports the use of nature-based solutions and soft-engineering over hard engineering solutions where possible.  A risk either exists or doesn't exist but it can be mitigated. Mitigation efforts must ensure that resolution of one problem is not replaced by others. Therefore, solutions involving nature-based and soft-engineering are preferable.	Allow part 57 of OS74.

## 32-General > 32.14-Earthworks

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS32.26	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Not Stated	Excavation slopes should be limited to no more than 45 degrees.	The higher density proposals in Variation 1 pose considerable risks to properties, hillside stability, and transport systems. These proposals also risk excess and contaminated run off from stormwater and sewerage systems and particularly risk

				<p>damaging the sensitive environment of Te Awarua-o-Porirua.</p> <p>Many of Porirua’s hillsides are unstable. This problem is made worse should steep sided excavations be made to accommodate high rise buildings.</p> <p>[Limiting excavation slopes to 45 degrees] would allow the slopes to better support the weight of higher parts of the hillsides, allow better and deeper-rooted vegetation to thrive and provide more opportunity for water to be absorbed and released progressively. Careful consideration should be given to potential hillside erosion.</p>
FS17.80	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.477	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Environment must be protected.

## 32-General > 32.17-Consultation

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS36.1	Charmaine Thomson	Not Stated	Explicit solutions for managed retreat, climate relief, being kaitiakitanga and housing options that benefit the affected current and future communities, not the developers.	It is well understood Pari-ā-Rua is growing, it is also important to remember everyone has the right to affordable and accessible homes, tika (ethical, upright) consultation and inclusive communication in the rohe where they have chosen to live or have lived for generations. Being explicit about managed retreat may help people plan for

				<p>considerable financial, accessibility and familial impacts.</p> <p>Submitter tautoko the whakaaro expressed by Ngāti Toa ō Rangatira in their letter of 21 Hūrae 2022 to PCC (on page 84 of the evaluation report) about the brevity of 'consultation' period in relation to impacts, especially for papakāinga, coastal marae, rural lands, retail, parking, and other current and future dwellings.</p>
OS36.2	Charmaine Thomson	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Opposes consultation period It is understood there are external drivers. The PDP evaluation reports do not offer a short story/image so people can quickly get the gist for their situation or simply make informed decisions about whether they are being nudged to retreat inland due to the levels of flood threat etc, and quickly understand the climate change and emissions impacts on the Pari - ā -Rua rohe.</p> <p>The PDP consultation might read like an open tender to developers or nudging people to retreat inland to more "affordable" dwellings - this poses a moderate-high reputational risk to PCC it might be aiming to attract more people to the rohe for economic growth.</p> <p>MFE, the Ministry for Disabled People, the Office for Seniors and the Human Rights Commission may have concerns about the current PDP approach, there may be some</p>

				unintended breaches of legislation, i.e., Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Human Rights Act (e.g., the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by Aotearoa, identifies housing deprivation as a human rights issue) due to unintentionally obscuring information using mono-lingual policy/technical jargon.
OS36.3	Charmaine Thomson	Not Stated	Recommend extending the 'consultation' period to a minimum of 3 months, or longer as per Ngāti Toa Runanga recommendations in the 21 Hūrae letter to PCC.	The scheduling of the PDP communication might be considered a little unwise given PCC rates payments are due on 20 August 2022, alongside the timing of local council candidate campaigning - this might land with media like an exercise in obscuring the intended positive engagement approach. It is understood MFE may have directed PCC to deliver a result by 20 August 2022.
OS45.1	Rita Hunt	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	There are reams and reams of bureaucratize which are hard to link together because one gets lost in the maze. Despite being only (?) available as an online document it is still laid out like on paper and only 'insiders' or folks with endless time and/or tenacity will make any sense of it. If it was not for the maps it would be a total waste of a document. There are thousands of words but the facts are hard to find. Submitter feels that as a ratepayer it is an insult to the population of Porirua for probably highly paid staff to compile such an unhelpful monster. If they understand it themselves they should have published a two Page summary.

OS51.1	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Not Stated	Submitter requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification plan change and variation.	Submitter wishes to express its support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety
FS17.122	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS60.7	Rosie Gallagher	Not Stated	Use locals for information and consultation.	They know how things work, who makes things work and what historically has and has not been adhered to.
FS17.262	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS77.1	Titahi Bay Residents Assn Inc	Not Stated	A recommencement of the submission process with a comprehensive drafting of all the additions and deletions proposed as variations to the Proposed District Plan made public so the overall resultant plan can be seen and considered properly in its entirety.	The disjointed, fragmented approach to supply of proposed changes via Internet links and consultant endorsements has made it impossible, in the short time frame, to consult our members, consider overall effects and make an informed submission.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]
FS17.416	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS77.2	Titahi Bay Residents Assn Inc	Not Stated	Recommencement of the submission process with a presentation of the comprehensive draft with an officer report and recommendations presented to a public meeting of the Council.	The formal, legal council approval process is required before officers are authorised to call for public submissions. Apparently that has not happened. The proper process allows public debate, councillor accountability and correction of any misunderstandings within the council prior

				to the submission process. That has not happened and the whole quasi-judicial process has been prejudiced by a confusing trail of conflicting public comment and misinformation from the Councillors and Mayor prior to submissions.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments]
FS17.417	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 32-General > 32.18-Whole plan

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS50.1	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Amend	Make the amendments to the PPDP sought in the Submitter's primary submission, except where addressed in its specific submissions on Variation 1.	<p>Submitter has a neutral position (neither supports or opposes) on the majority of the provisions of the PPDP introduced or amended by Variation 1, subject to the matters raised in its primary submission on the PPDP being addressed.</p> <p>In its primary submission, the Submitter noted specifically the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of the specific definition of "community corrections activity" consistent with the National Planning Standard definition, and the definition of "supported residential care activities".</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addition of “community corrections activity” as a permitted activity in the City Centre Zone (CCZ), Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), Local Centre Zone (LCZ), and General Industrial Zone (GIZ); and a discretionary activity in all other zones.</li> <li>• Retention of the permitted activity status of “supported residential care activities” in the General Residential Zone (GRZ), and Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).</li> <li>• Addition of “supported residential care activities” as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ).</li> <li>• Retention of various City Centre Zone (CCZ), Mixed Use Zone (MUZ), Local Centre Zone (LCZ), and General Industrial Zone (GIZ) objectives and policies to ensure the provision of community corrections activities in these zones is supported.</li> </ul> <p>Intensification and population growth in urban areas has an implication for the delivery of services Ara Poutama is required to provide in Porirua City. The Submitter considers intensification in urban areas enabled by Variation 1 provides additional justification for the above changes it has sought through its primary submission on the PPDP seeking suitable provision for</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				community corrections sites and residential accommodation (with support) within appropriate areas.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS76.363	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Allow	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, particularly as it relates to enabling and providing a consent pathway for supported residential care activities within the urban environment.
OS74.1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	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 Objective 12 and implement the Ngāti Toa statement and Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Implementation Programme. This is particularly in relation to how the District Plan can promote positive effects of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, which PCC should do through its RMA Section 31 functions. Te Mana o te Wai is a fundamental shift in approach which should be embedded in the District Plan, and drive an integrated management approach to freshwater in accordance with the principle of ki uta ki tai. Connections should be made between all freshwater-related chapters to ensure an integrated approach as required by the NPS-FM, and freshwater direction should be woven throughout the PDP from policy direction through to rules and assessment matters.	Variation 1 does not promote positive effects and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects, including cumulative effects, of urban development on the health and wellbeing of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems. It is Greater Wellington's view that this request is within scope given district plans must give effect to all relevant national direction (such as relevant parts of the NPS-FM) and therefore the relevant policies in the Proposed RPS Change 1 and operative RPS which seeks to give effect to national direction. Greater Wellington supports provisions, including the strategic objectives, that aim to protect and improve the environmental quality of Te Awarua o Porirua Harbour and its catchments. Every opportunity must be taken to reduce contaminant loads from the existing urban footprint where possible. Greater Wellington look forward to continuing to work with PCC on regulatory and nonregulatory changes for Whaitua implementation

			Adding policies along the lines of DEV-NG-P2 to apply district-wide, by amending the PDP as necessary, would go some way to satisfy the relief sought.	
FS17.326	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.30	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA
OS74.2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Incorporate the following provisions (or amendments to existing provisions) across the District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a strategic direction objective and/or policies to provide direction regarding ki uta ki tai, partnering with mana whenua, upholding Māori data sovereignty,</li> </ul>	Greater Wellington considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development.

			<p>and making decision with the best available information including Mātauranga Māori.</p> <p>Include a strategic direction objective and / or policy to require regard is had to equity and inclusiveness issues in decision making.</p>	<p>The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy IM.1: Integrated management - ki uta ki tai – consideration</li> <li>• Policy IM.2: Equity and inclusiveness – consideration.</li> </ul> <p>In regard to scope, matters addressed in the policy are related to district-wide matters which can be addressed in an IPI. Giving effect to this policy would also include how the IPI is developed and implemented.</p>
FS17.327	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.31	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow parts 1-16 of OS74. If the GW position was to prevail the Harbour Trust and GOPI would welcome a more tailored approach to intensification suitable for the local environment. We would support any requirements that would help full implementation of the Te Awarua o Porirua Whaitua Programme. We particularly support OS74.8 and OS74/10 as these would enable introduction of policies and rules around important water quality provisions.	Support this submission even though we have taken a pragmatic approach in our submission to generally support the plan variations PCC wishes to put in place to help mitigate the worst aspects of Government direction on enabling housing intensification. The Government requirements of local authorities are onerous in that they seek to apply intensification over most types of existing as well as new residential properties. Much of Porirua's built environment is on hilly and unstable slopes. Blanket provision of intensification is likely to lead to further issues detrimental to the environment. We, therefore, support GW's position of holding PCC to account for their responsibilities under Section 31 of the RMA

FS114.58	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	We seek for this part of the submission requesting incorporating objectives and policies regarding partnership with mana whenua, equitable decision making and protecting data sovereignty to be allowed.	This submission requests additional provisions that are important for upholding the partnership between Ngāti Toa and Porirua City Council. Partnership and equity in decision making by Ngāti Toa Rangatira can only be enabled by protecting our data sovereignty. We wish to have rangatiratanga over our mātauranga and data and support provisions that empowers this Kaupapa.
----------	----------------------------	---------	---	---

## 32-General > 32.19-Non-regulatory

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS1.2	Andrew Myers On Behalf Of Andrew Myers	Amend	Before any 3 storey dwellings in residential areas are built the infrastructure in the area has been upgraded to accommodate the new infrastructure for a period of no less than 30 years and has no impact to rates and taxes of existing properties.	<p>Water pressure would need to be adequate (the water pressure on a third storey building is likely to be insufficient in a number of areas). Water tanks may not accommodate the additional people living in an area. Roading may need to be upgraded to accommodate more vehicles or public transport upgraded – e.g. from a standard bus to a double decker bus to accommodate the additional patronage.</p> <p>Mobile Connectivity should be not be obstructed by high rise buildings creating dead spots etc. (listed 5 out of probably 40 things). Sufficient schooling capacity to accommodate new people. How is parking affected at both properties and commercial / park areas. Capacity at supermarkets increases to accommodate more people or additional supermarkets required prior to building etc.</p>

				As a result of these upgrades there will be substantial cost involved upfront and on-going and it's unfair to pass this on to existing house owners that are not upgrading or changing their property and so would need to be funded by new builds, built into new land costs. Submitter says that they would hate to see all utilities increase in cost as a result of this. (i.e. paying for internet provider to have more capacity in the area, or water costs increasing as a new reservoir needs to be constructed to accommodate the extra people or roads upgraded etc.
FS17.5	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS83.19	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	Resource the teams.	Councils' planning teams and consent enforcement teams are already vastly under-resourced. These need proper resourcing otherwise all this good change won't be worth the paper it's written on. Supports more rates being used for this vs for maintaining large sections of road seal to a high standard for driving and parking private vehicles. Supports combined / pooled consenting, design review, and other permitting resources that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.
FS17.1104	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS104.12	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports more rates being used for resourcing these teams vs for maintaining large sections of road seal to a high standard for driving and parking private vehicles. Councils' planning teams and consent enforcement teams are already vastly under-resourced. These need proper resourcing otherwise all this good change won't be worth the paper it's written on.
FS17.508	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS104.13	Frances Cawthorn	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions, that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.
FS17.509	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS110.1	T.C. Papakāinga Properties Ltd	Oppose	Would like to purchase 97 Conclusion Street to build for a whanau residence home/properties or keep it as a walkway but fenced off.	Approached the Council in 2015/2016 in regard to purchasing this section and intentions are still the same.
FS17.522	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS111.2	Pukerua Bay School BOT	Not Stated	That this development and variation includes land allocated to the future building of a community hall which caters for a range of indoor sports, and also a plan to build a 25m covered swimming pool.	Comments/concerns raised in relation to recreation areas and facilities for children.  The structure plan identifies recreational areas, a neighbourhood centre and open spaces for community members. These are good considerations but the children from

				<p>the community and school would benefit with some longer term thinking and planning in this area.</p> <p>Currently children from the school who partake in extra-curricula activities predominantly travel north to Paraparaumu or south to Porirua. Activities they partake in are mostly ball sport activities such as basketball, netball, rugby and soccer, as well as indoor gym and dancing related activities, and finally swimming lessons or swimming pool based activities. Currently there is significant pressure on many of the facilities where these activities take place. Swimming pool lane space is very hard to come by in Porirua and Paraparaumu, and the costs and availability of space at Te Rauparaha Arena is becoming prohibitive. These issues are likely to become exacerbated with increased population growth. Also, SH59 is now seen as less of a maintenance priority with Transmission Gully open, so local families can expect increased disruptions and sometimes closures to this highway following weather events.</p> <p>Pukerua Bay has a beautiful beach and all children from the school enjoy spending time here in the summer. However, there is no longer a swimming pool at the school to help ensure tamariki have adequate swimming skills to competently swim in the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				ocean. Neither is there a local pool and the closest swimming pools are in Porirua and Paraparaumu. A 2017 Otago University Study concluded that two thirds of New Zealand children can't swim 100m. This is a big concern with their proximity to the ocean and very limited pool access in the area.
FS17.524	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.496	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Impacts on education as well as the new recreation provisions need to be noted.
OS111.3	Pukerua Bay School BOT	Not Stated	That land is also allocated to an open field area that can cater for football and rugby.	<p>Comments/concerns raised in relation to recreation areas and facilities for children.</p> <p>The structure plan identifies recreational areas, a neighbourhood centre and open spaces for community members. These are good considerations but the children from the community and school would benefit with some longer term thinking and planning in this area.</p> <p>Currently children from the school who partake in extra-curricula activities predominantly travel north to Paraparaumu or south to Porirua. Activities they partake in are mostly ball sport activities such as basketball, netball, rugby and soccer, as</p>



				<p>well as indoor gym and dancing related activities, and finally swimming lessons or swimming pool based activities. Currently there is significant pressure on many of the facilities where these activities take place. Swimming pool lane space is very hard to come by in Porirua and Paraparaumu, and the costs and availability of space at Te Rauparaha Arena is becoming prohibitive. These issues are likely to become exacerbated with increased population growth. Also, SH59 is now seen as less of a maintenance priority with Transmission Gully open, so local families can expect increased disruptions and sometimes closures to this highway following weather events.</p> <p>Pukerua Bay has a beautiful beach and all children from the school enjoy spending time here in the summer. However, there is no longer a swimming pool at the school to help ensure tamariki have adequate swimming skills to competently swim in the ocean. Neither is there a local pool and the closest swimming pools are in Porirua and Paraparaumu. A 2017 Otago University Study concluded that two thirds of New Zealand children can't swim 100m. This is a big concern with their proximity to the ocean and very limited pool access in the area.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

FS17.525	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.497	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed in whole.	Impacts on education as well as the new recreation provisions need to be noted.
OS115.4	D Suzi Grindell	Not Stated	<p>It would help if the capacity of Papakowhai Road drains, waterways, and tidal cut-offs restored or repaired.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>Outlines having lived at the property for over 40 years and in previous submissions has raised mapping issues for the property due to out-of-date topographic mapping, with example given in relation to PCC tsunami maps. Given this inaccuracy raises comments/concerns in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small floods and run off, including that finds zoning of an areas in front of the section is exaggerated. Also that in general rainfall does not flood in the area marked flood detention, and sufficient drainage system installed - any possible problem from direct rainfall flooding is near insignificant.</li> <li>• Has taken care taken to ensure drain grating at bottom of cul de sac is kept clear of debri. Also to clear the culvert mouth at the bottom of the walkway to ensure free draining. In doing this there has never been flooding from this source over the area in front of the property.</li> </ul> <p>Experience two significant floods across Papakowhai Road in the 40 years lived</p>

				<p>there and these occurred in the last 15 years, (around the foot of Romesdale and Brora roadways), and smaller washes across the road but not enough to stop traffic. Outlines how floods at the bottom of Romesdale, resulted as much from a number of issues [relating to]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of capacity in the tidal cut-offs.</li> <li>• Lack of clearing drain gratings.</li> <li>• Pipes that service gratings on either side of Papakowahi Road at a low point south of the bus park, also seem to be almost blocked up.</li> <li>• In requesting that the flood designation only be removed to the macrocarpas: with the cut-offs now unable to absorb all the water a high tide water does pond; not necessarily over the road but enough to be interesting.</li> </ul> <p>If maintenance of the full draining system (not just a gutter clean) was thoroughly done, water could get away rapidly, and would help those who live by and all who use Papakowhai Road.</p> <p>Also notes that every time there is heavy rain, there is a fountaining of water which runs milky from the cliff facing Papakowhai Road. Identifies issues with this and asks</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				who can solve this problem and that cannot relate this to anything on the maps.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.588	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 32-General > 32.21-Plimmerton Farm

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS13.1	Carolyn Parris	Amend	Double glazing of 13 Motuhara Rd at council cost if the noise is a problem.	Concerned about the possibility of constant and long term noise coming across the valley during the build. Noise from the dog park already an issue. Has the right to live in peace and quiet for my wellbeing.
FS17.31	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS13.3	Carolyn Parris	Amend	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Concerned about the environmental effect on the flax swamp and stream due to so much permanent construction and likely run off.
FS17.33	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS17.2	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission].	Feedback on the following topics; 4. Insertion of the medium density residential standards into the Plimmerton Farm zone of the operative district plan, and enable higher density housing in part of

				<p>the Plimmerton Farm zone.</p> <p>Opposed to this form of building. Knows of people in Lower Hutt who are experiencing this form of building firsthand. Photos provided of what medium-density housing looks like. Two houses were purchased and demolished to erect 21 medium-density houses. Opposed to this form of intensive housing with such limited scope of what the consequences are for the neighbours, the whenua (Land) and the flora and fauna that this form of building ignores. In the identified case, an old Totara tree was cut down and disposed of without consideration for the Piwakawaka that lived in that tree and with zero regard for recycling such old and rare wood, which ended up at the dump.</p> <p>While this doesn't have any relevance to building houses in Porirua, it does have relevance to the impact on the people and land. Jamming these types of houses into existing neighbourhoods is an act of futility and highlights the council's shortsightedness toward long-term problems. If this form of construction is allowed to occur in areas like Plimmerton Farms the environmental impact would be disastrous for the native land, birds, flora, fauna, and people. This is a great opportunity that PCC has to create</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>housing, in harmony, with the land. Imagine if the council took the initiative and approved a plan for Plimmerton Farms that worked with the area as opposed to the pictures above and not just jamming people into houses for more rates money. While these problems are not new and include the added effects of more people, more cars, reduced green space, impacted shared community areas, increased sewerage operations (which currently can't cope now) and depleted resources which again are not new problems. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create a community that is future-proofed for all generations. In conclusion, the submitter is opposed to medium-density construction in existing neighbourhoods and Plimmerton Farms.</p>
FS17.37	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS23.2	James Baigent	Support	In regard to Plimmerton Farm, development should be restricted to the relatively low-land areas of that site without major cut and full earthworks.	Plimmerton Farm will inevitably be developed given its proximity to major transport corridors, but that development has the potential to be environmentally catastrophic. Officials seem to be able to convince themselves that with modern development practices Plimmerton Beach will remain swimmable after 6,000 - 10,000 waste and stormwater connections are made in its immediate vicinity. This is a

				beach much loved by generations of people from all over Porirua.
OS23.3	James Baigent	Support	In regard to Plimmerton Farm, all of the gullies and creeks should be fully revegetated.	Plimmerton Farm will inevitably be developed given its proximity to major transport corridors, but that development has the potential to be environmentally catastrophic. Officials seem to be able to convince themselves that with modern development practices Plimmerton Beach will remain swimmable after 6,000 - 10,000 waste and stormwater connections are made in its immediate vicinity. This is a beach much loved by generations of people from all over Porirua.
OS23.4	James Baigent	Support	In regard to Plimmerton Farm, stormwater filtration through new wetlands should be mandatory.	Plimmerton Farm will inevitably be developed given its proximity to major transport corridors, but that development has the potential to be environmentally catastrophic. Officials seem to be able to convince themselves that with modern development practices Plimmerton Beach will remain swimmable after 6,000 - 10,000 waste and stormwater connections are made in its immediate vicinity. This is a beach much loved by generations of people from all over Porirua.
OS23.5	James Baigent	Support	In regard to Plimmerton Farm, developer(s) should be forced to pay for a new main wastewater trunk running below SH1 then under the Harbour, and then under Titahi Bay to a new Wastewater Treatment Plant that will capable of meeting demand into the 2060s.	Plimmerton Farm will inevitably be developed given its proximity to major transport corridors, but that development has the potential to be environmentally catastrophic. Officials seem to be able to convince themselves that with modern development practices Plimmerton Beach will remain swimmable after 6,000 - 10,000

				waste and stormwater connections are made in its immediate vicinity. This is a beach much loved by generations of people from all over Porirua.
OS25.3	John O'Connell	Oppose	Remove the High Density sub-precinct.	<p>Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m height is too high and not needed. There will be adverse environmental and social effects. Part of PCC reasons for High Density housing in our area is the proposed PFZ is within walkable catchment of the Plimmerton Train Station which meets the definition of a rapid transit stop and to comply with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD and s77G of the RMA. This has been based inappropriately on a well-functioning urban development environment criteria – this is probably appropriate for urban areas like Porirua City CBD or Wellington City but certainly not for the village of Plimmerton.</p> <p>6 storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create lack of privacy for existing low-rise residential properties, with flow-on effect of reducing property values.</p> <p>Most houses in the area rely on northern aspect to provide warmth (as many houses already shaded on the eastern side due to hills) which will be blocked by 6 storey apartment blocks. There will be negative impacts on schools - there are only 2</p>



				<p>existing primary schools in the area which are already at maximum capacity and cannot handle a major increase in local population. The proposed HDRS zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already we are seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs. James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children – parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>There could be up to 2,000 additional people occupying the proposed HDRS in the southern end of Precinct A – say 18 families of 4 people in each apartment of a 6 storey block of 3 structures on 30 sections. As most new high density developments are discouraged from providing vehicle garages, the residents would be required to park on the existing roads, as it is inconceivable that the residents will only rely on public transport or bicycles to get across the Wellington region.</p> <p>There will be substantial varied housing already planned for by the current Plimmerton Farm developers (recent media coverage suggests up to 6,000 sites), and</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>therefore there is no justification for this part of the development to be zoned for High Density housing just because of the train station and some nearby shops.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Ta Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp). Retain the proposed area as green space.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to whether Porirua City Council plan addresses up to 6 storeys or minimum of 6 story developments. If regulations state minimum of 6 storeys and PCC implements up to 6 storeys (max 22m) then we could argue that PCC could not be trusted not to change it to suit at a later date.</p>
FS17.43	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS25.4	John O'Connell	Oppose	The proposed 1m distance from side and rear boundary should be reverted to existing restriction.	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m height is too high and not needed. There will be adverse environmental and social effects. Part of PCC reasons for High Density housing in our area is the proposed PFZ is within walkable catchment of the

				<p>Plimmerton Train Station which meets the definition of a rapid transit stop and to comply with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD and s77G of the RMA. This has been based inappropriately on a well-functioning urban development environment criteria – this is probably appropriate for urban areas like Porirua City CBD or Wellington City but certainly not for the village of Plimmerton.</p> <p>6 storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create lack of privacy for existing low-rise residential properties, with flow-on effect of reducing property values.</p> <p>Most houses in the area rely on northern aspect to provide warmth (as many houses already shaded on the eastern side due to hills) which will be blocked by 6 storey apartment blocks. There will be negative impacts on schools - there are only 2 existing primary schools in the area which are already at maximum capacity and cannot handle a major increase in local population. The proposed HDRS zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already we are seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs. James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>school children – parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>There could be up to 2,000 additional people occupying the proposed HDRS in the southern end of Precinct A – say 18 families of 4 people in each apartment of a 6 storey block of 3 structures on 30 sections. As most new high density developments are discouraged from providing vehicle garages, the residents would be required to park on the existing roads, as it is inconceivable that the residents will only rely on public transport or bicycles to get across the Wellington region.</p> <p>There will be substantial varied housing already planned for by the current Plimmerton Farm developers (recent media coverage suggests up to 6,000 sites), and therefore there is no justification for this part of the development to be zoned for High Density housing just because of the train station and some nearby shops.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Ta Ara Harakeke</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>(Taupo Swamp). Retain the proposed area as green space.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to whether Porirua City Council plan addresses up to 6 storeys or minimum of 6 story developments. If regulations state minimum of 6 storeys and PCC implements up to 6 storeys (max 22m) then we could argue that PCC could not be trusted not to change it to suit at a later date.</p>
FS17.44	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS25.5	John O'Connell	Oppose	Retain building coverage max 45%. Delete PApfz-S3 – Building coverage (50% and no maximum in the High Density sub-precinct)	<p>Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m height is too high and not needed. There will be adverse environmental and social effects. Part of PCC reasons for High Density housing in our area is the proposed PFZ is within walkable catchment of the Plimmerton Train Station which meets the definition of a rapid transit stop and to comply with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD and s77G of the RMA. This has been based inappropriately on a well-functioning urban development environment criteria – this is probably appropriate for urban areas like Porirua City CBD or Wellington City but certainly not for the village of Plimmerton.</p> <p>6 storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community</p>

				<p>vibe. It will create lack of privacy for existing low-rise residential properties, with flow-on effect of reducing property values.</p> <p>Most houses in the area rely on northern aspect to provide warmth (as many houses already shaded on the eastern side due to hills) which will be blocked by 6 storey apartment blocks. There will be negative impacts on schools - there are only 2 existing primary schools in the area which are already at maximum capacity and cannot handle a major increase in local population. The proposed HDRS zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already we are seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs. James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children – parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>There could be up to 2,000 additional people occupying the proposed HDRS in the southern end of Precinct A – say 18 families of 4 people in each apartment of a 6 storey block of 3 structures on 30 sections. As most new high density developments are discouraged from providing vehicle garages,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the residents would be required to park on the existing roads, as it is inconceivable that the residents will only rely on public transport or bicycles to get across the Wellington region.</p> <p>There will be substantial varied housing already planned for by the current Plimmerton Farm developers (recent media coverage suggests up to 6,000 sites), and therefore there is no justification for this part of the development to be zoned for High Density housing just because of the train station and some nearby shops.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Ta Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp). Retain the proposed area as green space.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to whether Porirua City Council plan addresses up to 6 storeys or minimum of 6 story developments. If regulations state minimum of 6 storeys and PCC implements up to 6 storeys (max 22m) then we could argue that PCC could not be trusted not to change it to suit at a later date.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

FS17.45	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS25.6	John O'Connell	Not Stated	Retain new MDRS for Precinct A under Operative PFZ PApfz-S1 at max height of 11m throughout.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.46	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS29.1	Andy Brown	Oppose	Start Again and re-design something way less intensive.	A greenfield location such as this is not the place for such massive and unrestricted development. In tandem with the general proposals under variation 1, this will have a disastrous impact on the existing infrastructure and localities. Couldn't be more against the entire proposal.
FS17.50	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS45.2	Rita Hunt	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Submitter has attempted to view and understand the proposed changes. Despite having some familiarity with this kind of material found it hard to understand. What is not made clear is whether a changed designation leads to out and out ability to proceed without restriction. One assumes not but this is not clear. Without more this makes it difficult to assess the true impact. For example, to permit a 6 storey building near the Plimmerton station seems completely out of character but perhaps this would never be approved for that reason. However, if these changes do mean developers can move in and change that



				<p>character then this seems wrong...the designations that permit 6 storey buildings should instead be medium density ie 3 storey maximum and the areas designated 3 storey not changed at all.</p> <p>Plimmerton - sea side is a small community with limited infrastructure particularly as regards storm water - there are also issues with the sea walls - moving more people into this confined area with threats of climate change seems shortsighted. These concerns also extend to the proposed extensive building at Plimmerton Farm - with significant flooding already experienced around the Palmers area and state highway 59 one wonders if adequate precautions have been put upon the developers to address these issues - where will the stormwater go from thousands of new homes? Councils are encouraged to think ahead - this does not seem to have happened as regards the considerable impact on our 3 waters let alone the impact on schools, roads and other community services.</p>
OS49.2	Susan Price	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Submitter has attempted to view and understand the proposed changes. Despite having some familiarity with this kind of material found it hard to understand. What is not made clear is whether a changed designation leads to out and out ability to</p>

				<p>proceed without restriction. One assumes not but this is not clear. Without more this makes it difficult to assess the true impact. For example, to permit a 6 story building near the Plimmerton station seems completely out of character but perhaps this would never be approved for that reason. However, if these changes do mean developers can move in and change that character then this seems wrong...the designations that permit 6 story buildings should instead be medium density ie 3 story maximum and the areas designated 3 story not changed at all.</p> <p>Plimmerton - sea side is a small community with limited infrastructure particularly as regards storm water - there are also issues with the sea walls - moving more people into this confined area with threats of climate change seems shortsighted. These concerns also extend to the proposed extensive building at Plimmerton Farm - with significant flooding already experienced around the Palmers area and state highway 59 one wonders if adequate precautions have been put upon the developers to address these issues - where will the stormwater go from thousands of new homes? Councils are encouraged to think ahead - this does not seem to have happened as regards the considerable impact on our 3 waters let alone the impact on schools, roads and other community</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				services.
OS51.2	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Not Stated	Submitter requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification plan change and variation.	Submitter wishes to express its support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety
FS17.123	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS54.1	KM & MG Holdings Limited	Amend	That the Council rezone the site commonly known as Plimmerton Farm to "Plimmerton Farm – Special Purpose" in the PDP planning maps.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]	KM & MG Holdings Limited (the submitter) owns the freehold title to the land known as Plimmerton Farm being Lot 2 DP 489799 in Record of Title 705739 (the site), as shown in Attachment A, and is the successor to Plimmerton Developments Limited (submission 149, further submission 21 on the Porirua Proposed District Plan). It is understood that the submission and further submission by Plimmerton Developments Limited will continue to apply to Variation 1 however, for the avoidance of doubt, the submitter formally adopts submission 149 and further submission 21 and the relief set out within for the purposes of Variation 1).
FS17.636	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS64.10	Brian Warburton	Oppose	That KM & MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to:	KM & MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters

			<p>- its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and</p> <p>- its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm;</p> <p>be rejected.</p>	<p>required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
FS68.7	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Oppose	That KM & MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to: - its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and - its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm; be rejected.	KM & MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters

				<p>required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
OS54.2	KM & MG Holdings Limited	Amend	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the overlays for the Plimmerton Farm site shown in the PDP planning maps, being qualifying matters for urban development of the site, be removed and replaced with the</li> </ul>	<p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Limited (the submitter) owns the freehold title to the land known as Plimmerton Farm being Lot 2 DP 489799 in Record of Title 705739 (the site), as shown in Attachment A, and is the successor to Plimmerton Developments</p>

			<p>same overlays provided in the Council rebuttal maps submitted through Plan Change 18 (PC18) to the Porirua District Plan. These overlays relate to Significant Natural Areas, Special Amenity Landscape (SAL006), Flood hazard – stream corridor, Flood hazard – overland flow, and Flood hazard – ponding; and/or;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environment map approved for PC18 needs to be updated to remove all additional Biodiversity Offsetting and Restorations Areas (BORAs) that were not included on the notified PDP precinct maps for PC18, and that the precinct maps for PC18 be updated to remove all of the additional BORA areas that were added to the plans that accompanied the Council’s section 42A report on PC18.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachment]</p>	Limited (submission 149, further submission 21 on the Porirua Proposed District Plan). It is understood that the submission and further submission by Plimmerton Developments Limited will continue to apply to Variation 1 however, for the avoidance of doubt, the submitter formally adopts submission 149 and further submission 21 and the relief set out within for the purposes of Variation 1)
FS17.637	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS64.11	Brian Warburton	Oppose	<p>That KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to:</p> <p>- its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and</p>	KM & MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters

			<p>- its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm;</p> <p>be rejected.</p>	<p>required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
FS68.8	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Oppose	<p>That KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to: - its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and - its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm; be rejected.</p>	<p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters</p>

				<p>required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
OS54.3	KM & MG Holdings Limited	Support	The submitter generally supports the policy intent and outcomes proposed by Variation 1 for the site, in order to continue to enable the development of the site as envisaged by PC18 to the Porirua District Plan. It is important however that likely qualifying	KM & MG Holdings Limited (the submitter) owns the freehold title to the land known as Plimmerton Farm being Lot 2 DP 489799 in Record of Title 705739 (the site), as shown in Attachment A, and is the successor to Plimmerton Developments



			<p>matters, as referred to in the submission point above, are accurate and correctly identified in the relevant planning maps for the site and do not unduly constrain the housing intensification and development capacity goals of Variation 1.</p>	<p>Limited (submission 149, further submission 21 on the Porirua Proposed District Plan). It is understood that the submission and further submission by Plimmerton Developments Limited will continue to apply to Variation 1 however, for the avoidance of doubt, the submitter formally adopts submission 149 and further submission 21 and the relief set out within for the purposes of Variation 1)</p> <p>See reasons set out in submission 149 and further submission 21. It is also important that the housing intensification and development capacity goals of Variation 1, as well as the intent and intended outcomes of PC18, are not constrained or otherwise compromised through inaccurate and unfounded qualifying matters being shown on maps and overlays for the site.</p>
FS17.638	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	<p>Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.</p>	<p>The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
FS64.12	Brian Warburton	Oppose	<p>That KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and</li> <li>- its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm;</li> </ul> <p>be rejected.</p>	<p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing</p>

				<p>Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
FS68.9	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Oppose	<p>That KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to: - its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and - its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm; be rejected.</p>	<p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing</p>

				<p>Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
OS54.4	KM & MG Holdings Limited	Amend	<p>The planning maps approved for PC18, and hence which are directly relevant to PC19, need to be updated to remove all additional Biodiversity Offsetting and Restorations Areas (BORAs) that were not included on the notified PDP precinct plan maps for PC18, and that the precinct plan maps for PC18 be updated to remove all of the additional BORA areas that were added to the plans that accompanied the Council’s section 42A report on PC18.</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in further submission 21 on the PDP, PC18 included a number of significant BORA mapping errors for the site that had been included by mistake and in a manner that lacked a legal foundation. This in turn prevented these mapped areas from being within the scope of any submissions to address their erroneous incorporation into PC18, a fact that was expressly acknowledged and accepted by the Independent Hearing Panel</p>

				<p>for PC18 (see page 61 of the Panel’s Final Report and Recommendations to the Minister for the Environment, dated 22 December 2020). These errors, if not rectified through Variation 1 and/or PC19, will likely act as qualifying matters that will inappropriately constrain the housing intensification and development capacity goals of Variation 1, and the realisation of the same goals in PC19, across Precincts A, B and C.</p> <p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Limited (the submitter) owns the freehold title to the land known as Plimmerton Farm being Lot 2 DP 489799 in Record of Title 705739 (the site), as shown in Attachment A, and is the successor to Plimmerton Developments Limited (submission 149, further submission 21 on the Porirua Proposed District Plan). It is understood that the submission and further submission by Plimmerton Developments Limited will continue to apply to Variation 1 however, for the avoidance of doubt, the submitter formally adopts submission 149 and further submission 21 and the relief set out within for the purposes of Variation 1)</p>
FS17.639	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS64.13	Brian Warburton	Oppose	That KM & MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to:	KM & MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the

			<p>- its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and</p> <p>- its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm;</p> <p>be rejected.</p>	<p>proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
FS68.10	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Oppose	That KM & MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to: - its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and - its	KM & MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the

			request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm; be rejected.	proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM & MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.
OS54.5	KM & MG Holdings Limited	Support	The submitter generally supports the policy intent and outcomes proposed by Variation 1 and PC19 for the site, in order to continue	See reasons set out in submission 149 and further submission 21. It is also important that the housing intensification and

			<p>to enable the development of the site as envisaged by PC18 to the Porirua District Plan. It is important however that qualifying matters, as referred to in the submission point above, are accurate and correctly identified in the relevant planning maps for the site and do not unduly constrain the housing intensification and development capacity goals of Variation 1 and PC19.</p>	<p>development capacity goals of Variation 1 and PC19, as well as the intent and intended outcomes of PC18, are not constrained or otherwise compromised across Precincts A, B and C through inaccurate and unfounded qualifying matters being shown on maps and overlays for the site.</p> <p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Limited (the submitter) owns the freehold title to the land known as Plimmerton Farm being Lot 2 DP 489799 in Record of Title 705739 (the site), as shown in Attachment A, and is the successor to Plimmerton Developments Limited (submission 149, further submission 21 on the Porirua Proposed District Plan). It is understood that the submission and further submission by Plimmerton Developments Limited will continue to apply to Variation 1 however, for the avoidance of doubt, the submitter formally adopts submission 149 and further submission 21 and the relief set out within for the purposes of Variation 1)</p>
FS17.640	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS64.14	Brian Warburton	Oppose	<p>That KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to:</p> <p>- its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and</p>	KM & MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters

			<p>- its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm; be rejected.</p>	<p>required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
FS68.11	Friends of Taupo Swamp & Catchment Inc	Oppose	<p>That KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd submission with respect to: - its request that the PC19 provisions be expanded in scope; and - its request that the Variation 1 provisions apply to the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm; be rejected.</p>	<p>KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd seeks outcomes from PC19 to the operative district plan that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan (PC19) as it was notified. PC19, as it was notified, specifically only addressed those matters</p>



				<p>required to give effect to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. PC19 is a statutory response to central government directives under the Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act, and in recognition that the provisions of Variation 1 would not (indeed cannot!) apply to the Plimmerton Farm site. The proposed district plan review, which is now subject to Variation 1, as it was notified, specifically excluded the land commonly known as Plimmerton Farm. The public notice dated 28 August 2020 said this: “It (being the city wide review) [my insertion] applies to all properties in the City except [my emphasis] for the area known as Plimmerton Farm that is the subject of Plan Change 18 to the Operative Porirua District Plan.” With its submission on Variation 1 KM &amp; MG Holdings Ltd therefore seeks outcomes from the variation to the proposed city-wide district plan change that are not within the scope of the proposed district plan as it was notified. It is a matter of law that the RMA provisions relating to variations cannot be used to change the provisions of an operative plan.</p>
OS58.95	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Due to operational and training requirements, the submitter has an interest in the land use provisions of PC19 to ensure that, where necessary, appropriate consideration is given to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements,</p>

				<p>particularly in relation to housing development (e.g. to ensure adequate consideration is given to risk reduction and emergency response requirements) and fire station development (e.g. to ensure the development of new fire station facilities are appropriately enabled, in the context of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources).</p> <p>To meet its statutory responsibilities, the submitter requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies;</li> <li>• the ability to undertake training activities for the firefighters within the region; and</li> <li>• adequate access and water supply for new developments and subdivisions to ensure that the submitter can effectively and efficiently respond to emergencies.</li> </ul> <p>There are three fire stations within the Porirua District [refer to original submission].</p> <p>The effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of a number of activities that may be anticipated in urban or peri-urban environments. In terms of</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>height requirements, fire stations will generally be single storied buildings of approximately 8 to 9 metres in height. Hose drying towers may also be required in some cases, which can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. Setback distances from road frontages are also required to accommodate the stopping of appliances outside the appliance bays, but off the road reserve area. Vehicle movements to and from fire station sites differ depending on whether a fire station accommodates volunteer or career firefighters, on the number of emergencies, and are primarily related to fire appliances movements and firefighter private vehicles. Noise will also be produced on site by operational activities such as cleaning and maintaining equipment, training activities and noise produced by emergency sirens. Training may take place anywhere between 7:00am and 10:00pm. Cleaning and maintenance will generally take place during the day; however, it can take place after a call out which can occur at any time. Generally, the submitter has assessed that a fire station will be capable of meeting the standards set out in NZS 6802:2008 Acoustics - Environmental noise (Table 3 - Guideline residential upper noise limits), with the exclusion of noise created by emergency sirens.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

FS17.228	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.96	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	The provision of adequate firefighting water supply access to that supply is critical. It is important to the submitter that any new dwelling or land use that does not have access to a reticulated water supply has access to an adequate firefighting water supply of some kind. This essential emergency supply will provide for the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the wider community, and therefore achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The New Zealand Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ/PAS 4509:2008 (Code of Practice) is a nonmandatory New Zealand Standard which sets out the requirements for firefighting water and access. The Code of Practice enables a consistent approach throughout New Zealand and allows the submitter to respond effectively and efficiently to a fire emergency. The Code of Practice provides techniques to define a sufficient firefighting water supply that may vary according to the circumstances and is based on an assessment of the minimum water supply needed to fight a fire and to limit fire spread. Volumes required vary according to each different building's fire hazards. The operative District Plan does not make reference to the Code of Practice 4509:2008, however, it contains multiple

				<p>provisions relating to the operational requirements of firefighters. The submitter acknowledges these provisions in the operative district plan and seeks to provide guidance to PCC as to how best to improve the provisions of the district plan with respect to providing firefighting water supply and access to better enable FENZ to meet its statutory responsibilities.</p> <p>Adequate access to both the source of a fire and a firefighting water supply is also essential to the efficient operation of the submitter. The requirements for firefighting access are set out in the Code of Practice and further detailed in FENZ's 'Emergency Vehicle Access Guidelines' (May 2015). A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is four metres in width and four metres in height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 1 in 5 (and accompanying transition ramps).</p>
FS17.229	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.97	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Requests that new stations are provided for in all zones permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activities with permitted standards appropriately recognising emergency services, such as through building height and access provisions which accommodate the requirements of fire stations.	New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that the submitter is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ therefore

				<p>considers that provisions within the District Plan are the best way to facilitate the development of any new fire stations within the district as urban development progresses. Depending on development, a new fire station could conceivably be required in any of the urban zones within the district and the submitter.</p> <p>In achieving the sustainable management of natural and physical resources under the RMA, decision makers must have regard to the health and safety of people and communities. Furthermore, there is a duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment. The risk of fire represents a potential adverse effect of low probability but high potential impact. Fire and Emergency has a responsibility under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 to provide for firefighting activities to prevent or limit damage to people, property and the environment. As such, Fire and Emergency has an interest in the land use provisions of the District Plan to ensure that, where necessary, appropriate consideration is given to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements, particularly in relation to subdivision and new developments.</p>
FS17.230	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS58.98	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PFZ-O1 Integrated Development as drafted.	Supports PFZ-O1 insofar as it promotes development which results in connected and integrated infrastructure and the efficient operation of the transport network.
FS17.231	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.99	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PFZ-O4 Well-functioning urban environment as drafted.	Supports PFZ-O4 insofar as it promotes well-functioning urban environments that provide for the safety of people and communities.
FS17.232	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.100	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Add a new objective as follows:  <u>PFZ-O6 Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>	Seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Plimmerton Farm-Zone area.
FS17.233	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.101	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Add new policy as follows:  <u>PFZ-P8 Servicing</u> <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	Seeks a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Plimmerton Farm-Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to PFZ-O6 and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.

FS17.234	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.102	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Relates to SUB<sub>PFZ</sub>-R2 and SUB<sub>PFZ</sub>-R3.</p> <p>Ensure existing/new subdivision standards require:</p> <p><u>The provision of a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Include a new matter of discretion as follow:</p> <p><u>The extent to which the site is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	<p>Supports SUB<sub>PFZ</sub>-R2 and SUB<sub>PFZ</sub>-R3 insofar as subdivisions within the Plimmerton Farm-Zone are a restricted discretionary activity. Notes compliance must be achieved with a list of SUB<sub>PFZ</sub> standard which have not been included in the Plan Change 19 document. Cannot confirm whether these rules are supported.</p> <p>Submitter's interests regarding subdivision relate to new allotments being provided with sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply. Seeks to ensure these matters are covered by either existing standards, or through the inclusion of new standards.</p> <p>Considers it important that the New Zealand Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice is directly referenced to ensure firefighting water supply provisions are visible and enforceable through subdivision rules.</p> <p>Seeks the inclusion of a matter of discretion where permitted conditions are infringed, relating to the matters outlined above.</p>
FS17.235	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.



OS58.103	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -P1 as drafted.	Supports PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -P1 insofar as it requires residential activities to be suitably serviced by infrastructure.
FS17.236	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.104	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -P3 as drafted.	Supports PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -P3 insofar as it enables non-residential activities that have an operational need to locate in the precinct. Fire Stations and other emergency service facilities often have an operational need to be located in specific areas or zones.
FS17.237	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.105	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Add a new Precinct A objective as follows:  <u>PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-O4 Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>	Seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Precinct A area.
FS17.238	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.106	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Add new Precinct A policy as follows:  <u>PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-P9 Servicing</u>  <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	Seeks a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Precinct A area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -O4 and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this precinct relating to the requirement to provide water supply.

FS17.239	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.107	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amend PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R1, PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R2, and PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R5 to PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R7 as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: <u>Compliance is achieved with PAPFZ-SX.</u></p> <p>Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary ... Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... <u>x. the extent to which the site is appropriately serviced, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	<p>Supports PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R1, PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R2, and PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R5 to PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-R7 subject to the acceptance of any relief sought regarding related standards and assessment criteria for these rules.</p> <p>It is vital that land use activities within the precincts are provided with adequate firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, to enable the ability to effectively and efficiently respond to an emergency onsite. As such, an additional standard that will require the provision of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, is sought for permitted activities. For restricted discretionary activities, an additional matter of discretion is sought. This will help give effect to proposed PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-O4 and PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-P9.</p>
FS17.240	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.108	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R4 Signs as drafted.	Supports PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R4 insofar as it makes allowance for the display of signs in the precinct as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.
FS17.241	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.109	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R8, PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R9, PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R11, PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R12, PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R13, as follows:	Seeks the inclusion of a matter of discretion that will provide Council with the scope to consider the sufficient provision of a

			Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... <u>x. the extent to which the site is appropriately serviced, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>	firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.
FS17.242	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.110	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R10 as drafted.	Supports PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -R10 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Discretion is restricted to the matters set out in PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -P3, which includes the operational need for the activity to establish within the precinct. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, may need to locate anywhere within this precinct.
FS17.243	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.111	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amendment to PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -S1 sought:  <u>This standard does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	Supports PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -S1 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building or structure. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for

				operational requirements. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. The inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers for both height and height in relation to boundary standards better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning in establishing and operating fire stations.
FS17.244	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.112	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Add a new Precinct A standard as follows:</p> <p><u>PAPFZ-SX Servicing</u></p> <p><u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and</u></p>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this precinct are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.

			<p><u>access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	
FS17.245	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.113	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -P1 as drafted.	Supports PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -P1 insofar as it requires residential activities to be suitably serviced by infrastructure.
FS17.246	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.114	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -P2 as drafted.	Supports PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -P2 insofar as it enables non-residential activities that have an operational need to locate in the precinct. Fire Stations and other emergency service facilities often have an operational need to be located in specific areas or zones.
FS17.247	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.115	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Add a new Precinct B objective as follows:</p> <p><u>PAPFZ-O3 Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained</u></p>	Seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Precinct B area.

			<u>through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>	
FS17.248	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.116	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Add new Precinct B policy as follows:  <u>PAPFZ-P6 Servicing</u> <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	Seeks a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Precinct B area are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -O3 and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this precinct relating to the requirement to provide water supply.
FS17.249	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.117	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R1, PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R2, and PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R5 to PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R8 as follows:  1. Activity Status: Permitted Where: <u>Compliance is achieved with PAPFZ-SX.</u>  Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary ...  Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... x. <u>the extent to which the site is appropriately serviced, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that</u>	Supports PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R1, PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R2, and PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R5 to PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R8 subject to the acceptance of any relief sought regarding related standards and assessment criteria for these rules. It is vital that land use activities within the precinct are provided with adequate firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, to enable the ability to effectively and efficiently respond to an emergency onsite. As such, an additional standard that will require the provision of firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, is sought for permitted activities. For restricted discretionary activities, an additional matter of discretion is sought.

			<u>supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>	This will help give effect to proposed PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -O3 and PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -P6.
FS17.250	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.118	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Amend PBPfz-R10, PBPfz-R11 and PBPfz-R12 as follows:  Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... x. <u>the extent to which the site is appropriately serviced, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u>	Seeks the inclusion of a matter of discretion that will provide Council with the scope to consider the sufficient provision of a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.
FS17.251	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.119	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R4 Signs as drafted.	Supports PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R4 insofar as it makes allowance for the display of signs in the precinct as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.
FS17.252	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.120	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R9 as drafted.	Supports PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -R9 as it allows for the development of an emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary land use activity. Discretion is restricted to the matters set out in PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -P2, which includes the operational need for the activity to

				establish within the precinct. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, the submitter may need to locate anywhere within this precinct.
FS17.253	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.121	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Amendment to PB<sub>PFZ</sub>-S1 Height and PB<sub>PFZ</sub>-S2 Height in Relation to Boundary sought:</p> <p><u>This standard does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u></p>	<p>Supports PB<sub>PFZ</sub>-S1 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building or structure. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. The inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers for both height and height in relation to boundary standards better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of the submitter in establishing and operating fire stations.</p>



FS17.254	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS58.122	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Add a new Precinct B standard as follows:</p> <p><u>PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-SX Servicing</u></p> <p><u>1. Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all developments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply, including a firefighting water supply and access to that supply, can be provided to each lot.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how sufficient firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, can be provided can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008</u></p>	Seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this precinct are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.
FS17.255	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS67.2	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Not Stated	Ryman seeks the relief sought by the RVA in its submission on Variation 1 and PC19.	Emphasises that Variation 1 and PC19 will have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for Porirua's growing ageing

				population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region.
FS17.648	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS74.79	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend PFZ-O4 to have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Submitter supports the objective to seek well-functioning urban environments in Plimmerton Farms, however requests that this objective and associated provisions have regard to how the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments have been articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS17.404	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.80	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Retain the application of the medium density residential standards in Precincts A and B.	Submitter supports the application of the medium density residential standards in Precincts A and B of Plimmerton Farms, subject to the other changes requested in this submission.
FS17.405	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.81	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:  Include policy that seeks nature-based solutions when providing for new infrastructure and in new developments, such as the use of green infrastructure.	Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as 'actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of

				<p>natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....’</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).</p>
FS17.406	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.82	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:</p> <p>Permit the development of green infrastructure in appropriate locations and subject to necessary controls, i.e.,</p>	Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as

			planting works undertaken by regional council.	<p>‘actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....’</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).t-wide matter.</p>
FS17.407	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS74.83	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:</p> <p>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>Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as ‘actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....’</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to</p>
---------	-------------------------------------	-------	--	---

				<p>providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).</p>
FS17.408	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.84	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:</p> <p>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,</p>	Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as 'actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas

			<p>including before they are mapped. Policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct the protection of areas that already perform a function as a nature based solution, including the many wider benefits these can have.</li> <li>• encourage the restoration of nature-based solutions.</li> </ul>	<p>emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....’</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).t-wide matter.</p>
FS17.409	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS76.3	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	For the most part, the submission by Kāinga Ora on the Plan Change is one of general support. Amendments are sought on specific matters.	<p>The changes sought are made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> </ul>

			[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</li> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.671	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS75.78	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern



				Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.36	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.10	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.60	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Not Stated	Supports in part Plan Change 19 and seeks consequential changes be made to Precincts A and B of the Plimmerton Farms Zone to give effect to the changes sought on the submissions Kāinga Ora has made on the equivalent	The changes sought are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Ensures that the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve</li> </ul>

			provisions and rules in the HRZ and MRZ chapters.	<p>the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, relevant national direction, and regional alignment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the s32 analysis has appropriately analysed and considered other reasonable options to justify the proposed plan provisions;</li> <li>• Reduce interpretation and processing complications for decision makers so as to provide for plan enabled development;</li> <li>• Provide clarity for all plan users; and</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019.</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.728	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS32.71	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.

FS32.85	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Oppose	Disallow	Strongly oppose proposals by Kāinga Ora that would lead to further intensification beyond the provisions proposed by PCC. Strongly oppose Kāinga Ora's requests on the basis that the adverse effects of doing so will impact on water quality and ecosystem integrity caused by increased run-off from hard surfaces and contaminants from increased numbers of vehicles parked on city streets. We also believe that removing restrictive controls limiting development on steep and south facing slopes is creating a recipe for future land slip disasters.
FS75.22	Roger Gadd	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations;</li> <li>• Allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora–Homes and Communities Act 2019. be disallowed.</li> </ul>	" While I may or may not support individual submissions from Kāinga Ora, I oppose these two reasons given in many of its individual submissions. Unless legislation or common law exists that requires Porirua city Council to comply with Acts of Parliament and Regulations that govern Kāinga Ora, these two reasons should not be considered by Porirua city Council in finalizing the District Plan. Kāinga Ora is an absentee landlord. Its interests are not fully aligned with those of existing residents. "
FS99.93	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS127.67	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS76.357	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Consequential changes to the provisions and rules within Precinct A and Precinct B of the Plimmerton Farms Zone to reflect relief sought in Kāinga Ora submissions on HRZ and MRZ provisions and rules.	Generally supports the updates made to the PFZ but seeks that all relevant changes and relief sought by Kāinga Ora on Variation 1 within the HRZ and MRZ chapters are carried over and reflected in the related provisions within Precinct A (including the high-density sub precinct) and Precinct B of the Plimmerton Farm Zone.
FS17.1025	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.390	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seeks that the complete submission be disallowed on the grounds that such vast changes to the PDP would need further rounds of consultation and public meetings for communities to fully understand the ramifications of what Kainga Ora are proposing. PCC needs to better represent	With out reading it all in detail I am opposed to the complete submission. It is too vast and detailed to expect submitters to comprehend what these proposals may mean for their communities in such a short consultation time frame. Kainga Ora has homes and communities in its title. What they are proposing would be destructive to

			the wishes of its rates payers and not those of central government	both and in no way promote or enhance the existing communities. The bullish attitude of increased height restrictions, disregard to one's privacy, ignorance towards flood mapping and modelling, manipulation of design requirements via wording changes is nothing but the actions of an under fire central government ministry that is failing its people
FS118.203	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Submitter supports in part. The RVA seeks for the submitter's changes to be allowed, but for any retirement village provisions to align with the RVA's primary submission.	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission, but seeks for any retirement village associated provisions in the Plimmerton Farm Zone to align with those outlined in the RVA's primary submission.
FS127.364	Rebecca Davis	Oppose	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be disallowed.	Submitter does not consider there is sufficient reasoning for requests. Does not consider environmental effects have been taken into consideration. Particularly the request for high density building in Pukerua Bay is not appropriate to the area.
OS79.14	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Amend	Seeks that the Plimmerton Farm Zone be considered a special case that has already been agreed and is underway, and should therefore stand as previously determined.	PC18 and PC19 apply to the Operative District Plan, not the PDP. There has been no indication of how the Plimmerton Farm Zone will fit into the new DP. There was extensive consultation on this Plan Change through a streamlined planning process with a final decision by the Minister for the Environment on the framework under which such a development could proceed. A key part of the approval was the protection of significant environmental values, including Taupō Swamp and catchment. Would be very concerned if

				<p>there was any degradation of this protection resulting from any DP variation.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the suitability of land designated for the High Density Sub Precinct in Precinct A through PC19. Much of the flat land on this site is subject to flooding, and the steep hill side up to Mo Street is unstable, as evidenced by a major slip event this year. Significant earthworks in this area could impact adversely on existing properties both above and below the site.</p>
FS17.432	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.379	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS81.36	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PFZ-O4 and PFZ-O5 as notified.	Supports the implementation of these objectives in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1070	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.37	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PFZ-P3, PFZ-P4, PFZ-P5, PFZ-P6 and PFZ-P7 as notified.	Supports the implementation of these policies in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1071	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.38	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -O3 as notified.	Supports this objective as it identifies the characteristics of the high-density precinct.

FS17.1072	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.39	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -S1 as notified.	Supports the implementation of the height standards in accordance with the requirements of the NPS-UD and the MDRS standards.
FS17.1073	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.40	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -S4 as notified.	Supports the implementation of the density standards in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1074	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.41	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -S1 as notified.	Supports the implementation of the height standards in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1075	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS81.42	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain PB <sub>PFZ</sub> -S4 as notified.	Supports the implementation of the density standards in accordance with the MDRS standards.
FS17.1076	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.3	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Not Stated	<b>Emissions reduction and VKT reduction need to be added to the Objectives of both documents. In Plimmerton Farm's case, the VKT and emissions reductions need to be at least 40% from 2022.</b>	Active travel should be the first-best choice for residents of the entire of Plimmerton Farm: all zones.  The objective needs to be specific enough that building-out of Plimmerton Farm can

				<p>only be done with street forms and transport networks that deliver on this objective. This includes by making private car driving less convenient (tighter corners, more constrained driving spaces, street environments with high place value that are self-explaining to a maximum of 30kph, discouragement from developers providing one or more carpark per dwelling), while making active travel extremely convenient, pleasant and attractive for people at all hours of day and night, for all ages and stages.</p> <p>It is simply ludicrous that professional transport engineers would proudly state that a greenfield development's roading layout and cross-sections meets NZS404, and then drop the proverbial mic, yet this is what will continue to happen without explicit, and specific, objectives.</p> <p>Cross sections provided by the submitter to the Hearing Commissioners are a starting point for standards.</p>
FS17.1088	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.4	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	<b>Add provisions to encourage development of the "missing middle"</b>	The availability of a range of housing typologies is a major issue in Porirua and looks likely to be deliberately perpetuated by Council actions, due to the flawed and apparently entirely baseless assumptions about "market desires" for housing: that Porirua people will overwhelmingly only



				<p>ever want to live in detached homes (see the HCBA discussion in Other comments). Specific provisions are needed to encourage the “missing middle” that’s not two-storey townhouses with garages.</p>
FS17.1089	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	<p>The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.</p>
OS90.2	Guy Marriage	Not Stated	<p>Need a route over SH59 to the other side of the road and the provision of a new rail station midway between Pukerua and Plimmerton</p>	<p>Considers that the Northern Growth Area is lacking one crucial thing - along with the Plimmerton Farm proposal - the need for a route over SH59 to the other side of the road and the provision of a new rail station midway between Pukerua and Plimmerton. The present gap between stations is excessive, but is justified at present as nobody lives between the two centres. With the addition of another 5-10,000 residents over the years, and the absolute need for these extra people not to have to drive to work, and not to have to drive across SH59 and park on the other side, it seems imperative for planning to made now for a future station, and for a future pedestrian / cycling link to be made for it now.</p> <p>Submitter envisages that a new train station would be somewhere near the present junction between the two schemes - ie near the existing farmhouses / Airlie Road junction - and hence also near the edge of the cemetery. This is presumably where a proposed new road access is made</p>

				<p>onto SH59 is made - but this should be planned now to have a generous pedestrian / cycle overbridge from east to west, separate from the road access below. That's the only way to ensure that future generations can easily catch the train - if we design in the infrastructure now, and that means designing to avoid pedestrians physically crossing the road (SH59) now and in the future.</p> <p>Submitter concerned about another 5000 cars pouring onto the highway at these points, because the two existing train stations are simply too far away to catch, and a proposed new station here would not work if people had to cross a busy highway.</p>
FS17.464	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS91.1	Russell Morrison	Not Stated	Submitter would like to see more surety from the PCC about how the existing wastewater system will be fixed by having its capacity enhanced and that no connections from the Plimmerton Farms or Pukerua Bay developments will be made to the system before that has been achieved.	Submitter has previously provided photographs showing manholes along Mana Esplanade discharging wastewater onto the footpath (and thence into the harbour) during heavy rain events, and the effects on our beaches and harbour waters. Despite past exercises in tracking down sources of stormwater infiltration, the situation has simply got worse For instance, a significant area of the footpath around the manhole outside 72 Mana Esplanade has in recent years been lifted, pitted and frequently coated with toilet paper because of the pressure on the system – with the

				<p>diluted sewage running into the Inlet at Pascoe Avenue causing contamination of the beach and harbour waters with bacteria and viruses contained in the wastewater. As this area is frequented by children and others playing in this water, significant public health risks are posed.</p> <p>Apart from these increasingly regular overflows, the submitter also understands that overflows from the emergency outlets because of problems at pump stations or breakages are not unusual.</p> <p>This is currently happening without the Plimmerton Farm and Pukerua Bay developments and without the additional growth associated with a potential Special Development Project (SDP) as well as the ongoing promotion of infill and intensified housing.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Report compiled by Envelope Engineering clearly states that “Wastewater discharge from the site could not connect to the existing public downstream reticulation without the current capacity issues being addressed” (and the same was said for the Plimmerton Farms development). But after discussing flow mitigation options, the report then states that “There would be no requirement for Council to undertake</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>immediate wholesale upgrades to the downstream reticulation system”.</p> <p>Based on past and present experience, the Submitter cannot have confidence that wastewater issues will be adequately provided for on the strength of such statements. Back in 2013, officer reports and correspondence with PCC’s Chief Executive (Gary Simpson) assured us that these problems would be relieved by activating the cross-harbour waste water line at Paremata within the 2013/14 year and/or installing sewer storage tanks at Dolly Varden by 2015/16.</p> <p>Neither has occurred and in June 2021 we were advised by Wellington Water that current planning for the design and construction of the Plimmerton-Mana-Camborne gravity sewer capacity increase project was to be between 2027/28 and 2031/32.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including photograph]</p>
FS17.465	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS91.3	Russell Morrison	Not Stated	Submitter would like to see is an acknowledgement that the proposed northern developments have the potential to generate significant extra traffic that is likely to have considerable adverse effects	The Submitter’s previous submission and presentation on the Plimmerton Farms development outlined some of the history and background to this matter – including the community expectations associated

			<p>on the existing character and amenity of other communities (particularly Paremata); and ensuring that those effects are not overlooked in the scramble for new development in the north.</p>	<p>with the completion of the Transmission Gully route (TGM) and concern that all the promised benefits would not eventuate if the effects of the developments were not recognised and addressed now.</p> <p>Since then, Waka Kotahi has decided not to honour a commitment by Transit NZ made to the local community before the Environment Court in 2001 to “to demolish the existing Paremata Bridge and remove the Clearways through Mana in conjunction with the opening of TGM”. Instead Waka Kotahi will be undertaking consultations over the next six months with various parties on a range of issues relating to how the current SH58 and SH59 should operate in future.</p> <p>The commitment was, in effect, an acknowledgement by Transit NZ that (a) the road would not remain in that form after TGM was completed because it could not meet desirable standards for such things as lane and footpath widths, noise, vibration and air quality levels, proximity to houses, etc. and (b) that the old bridge had a limited life and was likely to be having adverse impacts on the harbour.</p> <p>Removal of the clearways and reversion to one lane in each direction was expected to have obvious safety benefits in allowing lane and footpath widths as well as parking</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>and cycling space to be restored. Health benefits would also be significant with reductions in noise, vibration and air pollution levels.</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) produced by Tim Kelly Transportation Planning Ltd identifies one of the potential effects of the Pukerua Bay South variation as “the safety and efficiency of the wider SH59 corridor” and believes (page 16) that “even with measures to promote the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport, the use of private vehicles will be likely to remain the predominant mode of travel for residents to and from the Site for the foreseeable future”.</p> <p>The ITA also says (page 17) that the cumulative effect of Plimmerton Farms, Pukerua South and Muri Road Stage 1 developments (3590 dwellings in total) “has a potential to give rise to capacity issues within the local area road network” and concludes (page 35) that “the cumulative effect of the two developments (Plimmerton Farms and Pukerua Bay South) could result in traffic volumes in parts of the SH59 corridor returning towards, or even above, the levels experienced prior to the opening of the Transmission Gully project – this may affect the ability to ‘detune’ this route and may not be anticipated by residents enjoying the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>current levels of reduced traffic activity.”</p> <p>The report does mention on page 26 a need to demonstrate (at the time that specific development proposals are brought forward) that there will not be any significant adverse effects associated with the additional traffic activity upon the wider network.</p> <p>Submitter would suggest, however, that the potential for such high traffic levels and what measures need to be taken should be being discussed now – not at that late stage. There seems no reason to dishonour previous commitments at this stage but we need to acknowledge that the road (and the management of it) is not fit-for-purpose at present and to identify what changes will be needed to make it acceptable in the future. In the meantime it is important to ensure that the communities will not continue to be further affected by having to put up with sub-standard roads or increased community severance. (It may, for instance, be desirable now to be increasing setbacks for new buildings on Mana Esplanade to allow for future roading standards to be met.)</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
--	--	--	---

FS17.467	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS91.5	Russell Morrison	Not Stated	As Submitter mentioned in earlier submission, there will also be many other pressures put on community by the extra northern population. Assurances should be sought from PCC that these sorts of matters can be provided for in a timely manner without damaging the character of our existing communities and the environment.	Some of these will be welcomed by businesses and shops, etc. Others, however, may well require significant expenditure by the community (via rates) to allow for the additional numbers to be coped with. For instance, it is likely that there will be a need for extra boat launching and trailer parking facilities. Extra parking for commuters will need to be catered for. Dog exercise areas and enforcement resources will also be put under pressure.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.469	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS97.2	Fiona Reid	Not Stated	Amend Policy PA-P5 providing for high density housing.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.  Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children.



				<p>Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.472	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS97.3	Fiona Reid	Not Stated	Remove the high density sub-precinct.	<p>Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.</p> <p>Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children. Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.</p>
FS17.473	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS97.4	Fiona Reid	Not Stated	Retain new MDRS for Precinct A under operative PFZ- PA <sub>PFZ</sub> -S1 at maximum height of 11m throughout.	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.

				Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children. Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.
FS17.474	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS97.5	Fiona Reid	Not Stated	Proposed 1m distance from side and rear boundary be reverted to existing restriction.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.  Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children. Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.
FS17.475	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS97.6	Fiona Reid	Not Stated	Retain building coverage maximum 45%.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe.

				<p>It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.</p> <p>Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children. Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.</p>
FS17.476	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS97.7	Fiona Reid	Not Stated	Delete P <sub>APFZ</sub> -S3 - Building Coverage (50% and no maximum in the HD Sub-precinct).	<p>Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.</p> <p>Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children. Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.</p>
FS17.477	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS101.2	Melissa Story	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Against Kainga Ora building social housing in Plimmerton Farm.</p> <p>Submitter states:</p> <p>"Social housing can bring with it a range of issues. Sadly this includes people affiliated with gangs. By spreading social housing into a more affluent area such as Plimmerton, this would divert police resources geographically which are currently more concentrated in Cannons Creek, Waitangarua etc. In the same way you wouldn't want student flats, next to a retirement village People with different needs will clash. There will be major unrest in the community if this goes ahead and mass exodus of the higher rate paying portion of the community. While the mayor has stated "they are just people in red coats", this is naive. Jacinda Adern wears a red coat, a certain gang wears a red coat. Spot the difference?"</p>
FS17.1116	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS106.3	Michael Kearns	Not Stated	<p>Amend policy PA<sub>PFZ</sub>-P5 providing for High Density Sub-precinct.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>Opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs.</p> <p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create</p>

				<p>a lack of privacy and potential loss of sun for existing low-rise existing residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs.</p> <p>James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children - parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Te Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.513	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS106.4	Michael Kearns	Oppose	Remove the High Density sub-precinct.	<p>Opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs.</p> <p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create</p>

				<p>a lack of privacy and potential loss of sun for existing low-rise existing residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs.</p> <p>James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children - parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Te Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp).</p>
FS17.514	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS106.5	Michael Kearns	Oppose	Retain new MDRS for Precinct A under Operative PFZ PApfz-S1 at max height of 11m throughout.	<p>Opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs.</p> <p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create</p>

				<p>a lack of privacy and potential loss of sun for existing low-rise existing residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs.</p> <p>James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children - parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Te Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp).</p>
FS17.515	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS106.6	Michael Kearns	Oppose	<p>Proposed 1m distance from side and rear boundary be reverted to existing restriction.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>Opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs.</p> <p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create</p>

				<p>a lack of privacy and potential loss of sun for existing low-rise existing residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs.</p> <p>James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children - parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Te Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp).</p>
FS17.516	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS106.7	Michael Kearns	Oppose	<p>Retain building coverage max 45%.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]</p>	<p>Opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs.</p> <p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create</p>



				<p>a lack of privacy and potential loss of sun for existing low-rise existing residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs.</p> <p>James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children - parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Te Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp).</p>
FS17.517	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS106.8	Michael Kearns	Oppose	Delete PApfz-S3 - Building coverage (50% and no maximum in the HD sub-precinct).	<p>Opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs.</p> <p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>Six storey buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create</p>

				<p>a lack of privacy and potential loss of sun for existing low-rise existing residential properties.</p> <p>The proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use the new Transmission Gully route to save on fuel costs.</p> <p>James Street is a narrow street at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents of the high-rise buildings and St Theresa's school children - parking on James Street is already heavily congested at school drop-off/collection times, funerals and Catholic Church activities.</p> <p>The area proposed is already subject to climate change issues including sea level rise and internal flooding, and there will be adverse effects from huge structures covering areas not allowing sufficient rainwater to soak into the ground. This will also negatively affect Te Ara Harakeke (Taupo Swamp).</p>
FS17.518	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS114.1	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	Amend PFZ-04 accordingly to reflect well-functioning urban environment also enables Tangata Whenua.	A well-functioning urban environment does not only enable people and communities but should also enable Tangata Whenua and members of iwi.
FS17.529	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.164	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support amendments to the objective to reflect the aspects of a	Greater Wellington support relief seeking that the objective is further qualified to reflect the aspects of a well-functioning

			well-functioning environment more broadly, as per Proposed RPS Change 1.	environment more broadly, which has regard to Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS127.392	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Oppose	In relation to PFZ-04, wellbeing framework that the well-functioning urban environment should provide for must also include environmental well-being, not just the social, economic and cultural wellbeing. Amend wording to include environmental wellbeing.	A well-functioning urban environment does not only provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing but it must provide for the environmental wellbeing.
FS17.530	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.165	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support amendments to the objective to reflect the aspects of a well-functioning environment more broadly, as per Proposed RPS Change 1.	Greater Wellington support relief seeking that the objective is further qualified to reflect the aspects of a well-functioning environment more broadly, which has regard to Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.
FS127.393	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.3	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	Amend PFZ-05 to be clear in the purpose of 'Housing Choice' in its inclusiveness and ensure the crafting of the Objective that the neighbourhood's planned urban built character does not prevent Tangata Whenua to establish papakāinga housing and perform its related activities in a permitted planning framework.	Te Rūnanga is unclear whether Precincts A and B enable Papakāinga housing despite that the Objective PFZ-05 is written to be inclusive.  Clause (b) should not be an excuse for Papakāinga type housing to be not enabled, for instance, if in the future, this Zone

				evolves to become different than what is proposed at the moment.
FS17.531	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.166	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support the addition of new provisions to support and provide clarity for how papakāinga developments will be enabled in the PFZ.	Greater Wellington support further clarity regarding where and how papakāinga will be provided for in the PFZ.
FS127.394	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.
OS114.4	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	Support	Draft new policies that support Papakāinga developments and support this with additional rules where Papakāinga is enabled as a permitted activity.	Precinct A and B do not have references to Māori housing and papakāinga type developments.  Since there is not a policy that enables papakāinga development under the PFZ, Te Rūnanga aren't seeing whether Papakāinga activities are permitted or how they could be treated in the future
FS17.532	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS74.167	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Support	Greater Wellington support the addition of new provisions to support and provide clarity for how papakāinga developments will be enabled in the PFZ.	Greater Wellington support further clarity regarding where and how papakāinga will be provided for in the PFZ.
FS127.395	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that point be allowed.	It is important for all these aspects to be considered before any development poses significant risk to the area that cannot be undone.

OS116.2	Frances Dodge	Oppose	Remove the high density sub-precinct completely that allows buildings up to 22m high and retain the 11m high height limit throughout.	22m height is too high for a suburban residential area. Shading and privacy effects would be beyond substantial and the area is far from a walkable distance to Porirua CBD. The rolling hills and natural environment and outlook would be ruined. The proposed area in which the high density proposal sits is extremely prone to flooding – this area should not be built on full stop, let alone 22m high. Sea level rises are very real. Why propose to develop areas so close to the ocean given the future outlook regarding climate change? The hill side parts of Plimmerton Farms are fine but the low lying areas especially around the roundabout should be left as green space for the future.
FS17.590	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS116.5	Frances Dodge	Oppose	Increase the front yard setback back to 5m or at least 3m in all zones.	Plimmerton Farms is not within walking distance to Porirua CBD. There are no local high schools. There is only 1 intermediate school for the entire area which is already at capacity. People will need cars to go to the CBD and to and from school at a minimum given it will almost 100% be outside of the Plimmerton area. Whilst some of Plimmerton Farms is within walkable distance to the train station, you cannot do your weekly grocery shop on the train. Kids sports and activities are at all hours of the day and public transport does not suffice. Cars will overrun the streets

				which are also proposed to be extremely narrow as seen in other developments.
FS17.593	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	PC19 needs to adequately address the critical need for retirement accommodation and aged care in the District.	New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD). <sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and

				<p>whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.4	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.4	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide a clear and consistent regime for retirement villages.	<p>New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD).<sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises</p>

				<p>that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.6	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.6	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	That the potential effects from retirement villages are managed proportionately and efficiently with the least regulation and prescription necessary.	<p>New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-HUD).<sup>1</sup> The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly</p>



				<p>fundamental to wellbeing". The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that "[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want".</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.8	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.8	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	The significant benefits of retirement villages need to be given appropriate weight.	<p>New Zealand, including Porirua District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The under-provision of retirement living and aged care in New Zealand is at crisis point, with the growing ageing population facing a significant shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options. This problem is immediate, and demographic changes mean that the demand for retirement accommodation and aged care will continue to grow. The Government recently recognised the ageing population as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand in its overarching direction for housing and urban development – the Government Policy on Housing and Urban Development (GPS-</p>

				<p>HUD).1 The GPS-HUD records that “[s]ecure, functional housing choices for older people will be increasingly fundamental to wellbeing”. The government strategy Better later life – He Oranga Kaumatua 2019 to 2034 recognises that “[m]any people want to age in the communities they already live in, while others wish to move closer to family and whānau, or to move to retirement villages or locations that offer the lifestyle and security they want”.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.10	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.12	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Ensure that the Porirua District Plan specifically and appropriately provides for and enables retirement villages in all relevant residential and commercial/mixed use zones.	<p>In order to meet the Enabling Housing Act requirements, to give effect to the NPSUD, and respond to the significant health and wellbeing issues created by the current retirement housing and care crisis.</p> <p>Important to emphasise that the Enabling Housing Act does not only require Tier 1 councils to implement the medium density requirements in relevant residential zones but also to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSUD regarding intensification of urban environments. Accordingly, Variation 1 and PC19 also needs to enable intensification (through building heights and densities) that responds to the location of centres and rapid transit stops. In some cases, that</p>

				<p>intensification is to include “building heights of at least 6 storeys” and must achieve the objective of enabling more people to live in areas where there is a high demand for housing (Objective 3 of the NPSUD).</p> <p>This outcome can only be achieved by providing for a retirement village-specific objective, policy and rule framework. In the experience of RVA members, without a specific framework, retirement village proposals face material uncertainty and consenting barriers as council officers attempt to apply general residential approaches that are not fit-for-purpose to retirement villages.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.14	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.15	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Better enable housing and care for the ageing population.	<p>Promoting the wellbeing of older persons within our communities requires district plans to better enable the construction of new retirement villages. Cumbersome, rigid and uncertain resource management processes and practices are a major impediment to delivering necessary retirement housing and care. Resource consent processes take too long, are unnecessarily complex, and often do not provide for retirement living options</p>

				<p>properly because the relevant plans are not fit for purpose.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS67.17	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.19	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide for change to existing urban environments in order to achieve the intensification envisaged in Policy 3 of the NPSUD. Explicitly acknowledge that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are a driver of appropriate and necessary change because of demographic ageing and the increasing housing needs of older people.	<p>In order to respond to the significant issues created by the retirement housing and care crisis.</p> <p>There are key differences between retirement villages and 'typical' residential dwellings. These differences mean that retirement villages do change the existing urban environments that are dominated by 'typical' dwellings, and this has not been acknowledged properly in planning frameworks leading to a range of consenting challenges. Because of their functional and operational needs, retirement village and aged care facilities tend to be larger (in height and bulk) than 'typical' residential housing in order to properly cater for resident needs.</p> <p>Retirement villages contain a range of unit types to cater for the different care and mobility needs of the residents. The accommodation ranges from independent townhouses and apartments, through to serviced apartments, hospital beds and dementia rooms. While independent living villas, townhouses and apartments will include full kitchens, bathrooms, lounges and other household amenities, serviced</p>

				<p>apartments and care rooms will not always have these amenities. These factors may be a key driver for the layout and amenities within a unit and also within a village. For example, serviced apartments and care rooms need to have quick, accessible, and all weather access to communal living and dining areas. In the experience of RVA members', council officers often attempt to redesign village layouts based on what they think might be suitable, without proper knowledge of villages and residents' needs. Retirement villages often include a wide range of amenities and services for resident needs and convenience. Services range from communal indoor and outdoor amenity areas, gardens, pools, gyms, libraries, reflection spaces, hairdressing services and cafés and bars through to welfare and medical facilities. These are important amenities and services as many retirement village residents are frail or have mobility restrictions (making it more difficult for them to travel to access amenities and services). They also provide a better quality of life for residents than could be offered without these communal amenities and services. For example, a townhouse would not have space for a pool or gym. Retirement villages also use new, low maintenance building products and design techniques to ensure their efficient operation. These design requirements can result in change when compared to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>surrounding neighbourhoods that were built many decades in the past. Communities (particularly neighbouring landowners seeking to preserve status quo interests) and council officers often can have an expectation as to how sites are going to be used. Typically, that expectation is not for medium or higher density retirement accommodation. In part, this is because, traditionally, planning provisions have ignored the unique features of retirement villages. Further, the significant positive effects and community benefits of retirement villages are sometimes not given sufficient weight. The failure of district plans to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and provide for change to the character and amenity of existing neighbourhoods to enable the benefits of retirement villages, has created significant consenting challenges. The NPSUD now requires district plans to provide for this change to existing urban environments. It creates an expectation that “New Zealand’s urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations” (Objective 4). Further, the NPSUD recognises that amenity values can differ among people and communities, and also recognises that changes can be made via increased and varied housing densities</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>and types, noting that changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect (Policy 6). The importance of this direction is also clearly set out in the Ministry for the Environment's (MfE) and the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) final decisions report on the NPSUD. The Enabling Housing Act further supports this need for change by enabling medium density housing to be developed as a minimum in all relevant residential zones. Although the MDRS generally captures retirement villages under the umbrella of residential activities, the framework fails to recognise the unique operational, functional and locational features of retirement villages. Specific provision is therefore necessary to enable much needed retirement housing and care.</p>
FS67.21	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.21	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites	<p>Sites in existing residential areas that are appropriate for retirement villages are extremely rare, due to the need for sites to be large enough to accommodate all parts of a village and be located in close proximity to community services and amenities. Given large sites are a rare resource, it is important they are developed efficiently to maximise the benefits from their development. This approach is consistent with the enabling intensification</p>

				<p>approach of the NPSUD. As well as providing intensification opportunities, large sites also provide unique opportunities to internalise potential impacts of intensification on neighbours and the neighbourhood. For example, additional height can be located towards the centre of a site without adverse dominance, shading or privacy effects. This approach was adopted in the Auckland Unitary Plan, with the residential zones including a policy to enable more efficient use of larger sites.</p>
FS67.23	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.23	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Recognise the unique internal amenity needs of retirement villages.	<p>A key consenting challenge faced by the RVA members is an expectation from council officers that the internal amenity controls used for traditional housing typologies (e.g. outlook, sunlight, privacy, outdoor living spaces, landscaping and the like) are appropriate for retirement villages. This approach fails to recognise the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages (discussed above). For example, residents have access to a wide range of communal spaces as well as their individual homes, so their amenity is provided by the village as a whole rather than an individual space. This means that internal amenity standards, such as outlook space, do not have the same level of relevance to retirement villages as to typical residential housing. Other factors,</p>



				<p>such as proximity to communal spaces, may be more relevant to the overall level of amenity experienced by residents. This approach also fails to recognise that retirement village operators have a long and positive track record and understanding of what works for their residents. Over many years they have provided high quality environments for their residents – significantly better than typical housing typologies have delivered. Retirement village operators rely on their reputation, which would be quickly diminished by bad publicity. The quality of life provided to residents is therefore paramount to the RVA’s members.</p> <p>There are two internal amenity standards in the Enabling Housing Act that require amendment when applied to retirement villages:</p> <p>Outdoor living space: Retirement villages provide a range of private and communal outdoor areas that can be enjoyed by residents. All of these areas should be counted towards this amenity standard. In addition, retirement village residents tend to spend a significant amount of their recreational time inside, given their sensitivity to temperature extremes. A proportion of these indoor areas should also be counted towards this amenity standard to reflect the actual usage</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>patterns of village residents.</p> <p>Outlook space: The standard is not workable for all units across a comprehensive site. Furthermore, such a standard is simply not needed. Residents of a village have a much greater degree of choice of 'living rooms' than residents of typical residential dwellings (including communal sitting areas, dining rooms, a library, activity room and chapel). These communal spaces are typically well orientated for daylight and enjoying an outlook into a large and attractive outdoor space.</p>
FS67.25	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.25	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide clear and focused matters of discretion	<p>Faced significant cost and delay in consenting retirement villages in residential zones. Often, the process requirements are significantly out of proportion with the adverse effects of the activity, and do not recognise its substantial benefits. An example of this issue is excessive and extraneous information requests. Over time, the amount of information that is required to support an application for consent has substantially increased. Council officers often request information that is not relevant to the assessment of the effects of a retirement village proposal, such as information regarding electricity supply, internal lighting, hallway width, planter box size, and outdoor furniture. It is</p>

				<p>not uncommon to receive unsolicited design change requests from council urban designers. These requests add cost and delay, and distract from the key issues. Council officers have too much discretion to require applicants to provide further information, and have the ability to wield the threat of notification if the requested information is not provided. By way of example, one RVA member received seven requests for further information following lodgement of an application, which resulted in a five month delay in the decision being issued. Another application resulted in four further information requests and a four month delay.</p> <p>It is therefore important that matters of discretion for decision-making are clear and focused on the aspects that matter.</p>
FS67.27	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.27	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide appropriately focused notification rules.	<p>Notification is a significant cause of the cost and delay of consenting processes. RMA processes currently provide multiple opportunities for opposition to projects, which is the reason for significant delays in processing consents, and does not ensure good outcomes. Notification is often a cause of much angst for developers. 'NIMBYism' is rife. Self-interested neighbours can create huge delays and disputes for no material environmental benefit. Although notification has an important role in the RM system, it must be</p>

				<p>proportional to the issues at hand. It is only beneficial, and should only be required, where notification is likely to uncover information that will assist the decision-making process. The costs of public notification are too high for it to be required simply for persons to 'be heard'. Applications for residential activities that are anticipated in residential zones (i.e. through restricted discretionary activity status) should not be publicly notified. Rather, the time for public participation is at plan making stage where residential zones and appropriate/inappropriate activities can be clearly identified. This approach aligns with the Enabling Housing Act which precludes public notification for residential proposals. Limited notification should remain available as it provides for neighbours to participate when they are likely to be impacted by a next-door development. However, given the significant costs associated with notification, it should only be required where it will benefit the decision-making process. Where an application meets the expectations for development in an area (i.e. through compliance with external amenity standards), there should be no need for limited notification. This approach aligns with the Enabling Housing Act which precludes limited notification for residential proposals that comply with relevant standards.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

FS67.29	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.29	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Use the MDRS as a guideline.	The Enabling Housing Act sets medium density residential standards that guide when residential activities require closer assessment and when limited notification of proposals can be available. The retirement village-specific framework sought by the [submitter] takes a similar approach (given retirement villages are a form of development with four or more residential units) with the standards informing matters of discretion and limited notification presumptions. The Enabling Housing Act will result in a level of standardisation that will set expectations for the scale of development across the country. The standards have been deemed to 'cover the ground' in relation to the key matters relevant to residential proposals. With some amendments to reflect the specific nature of retirement villages, the standards also set a relevant baseline for identifying standards relevant for the construction of retirement villages.
FS67.31	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.32	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that PC19 are amended to provide a fit-for-purpose retirement-village specific framework.	To address the issues outlined.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS67.34	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

OS118.34	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amendments to the MDRS are required to ensure they are workable to retirement villages.	Supports the incorporation of the MDRS into the Proposed Plan without any amendments that read down or alter their interpretation. These amendments do not change the intent of the MDRS.
FS67.36	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.36	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Amendments to other Proposed Plan provisions.	[The amendments sought are] necessary to ensure there is no conflict, overlap or inconsistency with the MDRS. For example, RESZ-P7 and P8 set out extensive requirements (a number of which are not relevant to encouraging 'high quality' development) for development not meeting permitted activity standards. These policies therefore conflict with RESZ-P6 (and Policy 5 of the MDRS) to provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status. A failure to make these amendments will give rise to significant interpretation issues and uncertainty when the Plan is applied.
FS67.38	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.38	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>The objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan must enable appropriate accommodation and care for the aging population as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An objective to provide for the housing and care needs of the ageing population;</li> <li>• A policy that recognises the need for change over time to the existing</li> </ul>	The rapidly aging population is a significant resource management issue. RESZ-P13 and MRZ-P6 are not sufficiently enabling of retirement villages as the provision for retirement villages is qualified by a number of matters. The policy does not recognise and provide for the benefits of retirement villages and their functional and operational needs. Additional objectives and policies are also required.

			<p>character and amenity of neighbourhoods to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the community;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy that recognises the need to provide for a range of housing and care options for older people and to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages;</li> <li>• A policy to enable the efficient use of larger sites;</li> <li>• A policy that directs that density standards are to be used as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</li> </ul>	
FS67.40	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.41	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Retirement villages need to be provided for as a residential activity and enabled as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rule that permits the use and operation of retirement villages, recognising that this activity is expected and encouraged in residential zones;</li> <li>• A rule that regulates the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, recognising that this activity is anticipated in residential</li> </ul>	<p>Retirement villages are required to be restricted discretionary activities under the MDRS as they require “the construction and use of 4 or more residential units on a site”. The Variation includes Rules HRZ-R19 and MRZ-R22, which regulate retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity. The restricted discretionary status is inappropriate as it does not recognise that retirement villages are an appropriate activity in residential zones. Therefore seeks a permitted activity rule for the use and operation of retirement villages (consistent with HRZ-R5 and MRZ-R5 for</p>

			zones with limited matters requiring assessment.	other residential activity). The Variation regulates the construction of retirement villages under Rules HRZ-R1 and MRZ-R1. Supports the restricted discretionary activity status that would apply to retirement villages under these rules (being four or more residential units on a site), but opposes the matters of discretion.
FS67.43	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.43	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Provide tailored and fit for purpose retirement village matters of discretion, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise the positive effects of retirement villages;</li> <li>• Focus effects assessments on exceedances of relevant standards, effects on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces, and effects arising from the quality of the interface between the village and adjacent streets or public open spaces to reflect the policy framework within the Enabling Housing Act. A degree of control over longer buildings is also acknowledged as appropriate; and</li> <li>• Enable the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to be taken into account when assessing effects.</li> </ul>	Retirement villages are different to typical residential dwellings, and therefore do not necessarily fit in with the typical controls imposed on residential developments. The Variation does include tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages through the reference to the retirement village policy. Opposes the matters of discretion set out under RESZ-P13 as they are broader than the matters relevant under the MDRS and they do not allow for consideration of the positive effects of retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. It is important that other rules do not render retirement villages discretionary or non-complying and therefore lose the benefit of clear and focused matters of discretion.
FS67.45	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	



OS118.45	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Limited notification should only be available where a retirement village application breaches one or more of the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards and the relevant RMA effects threshold is met.	A key consenting issue for retirement village operators across the country relates to the delays, costs and uncertainties associated with notification processes. Consistent with the direction of the Enabling Housing Act, applications for retirement villages in the relevant residential zones should not be publicly notified based on density effects. In addition, limited notification should only be used where a retirement village application proposes a breach of a relevant density standard that manages external amenity effects and the relevant effects threshold in the RMA is met. It is noted that the Variation precludes public notification of retirement villages (HRZ-R19 and MRZ-R22). However, limited notification is available where the relevant RMA effects threshold is met.
FS67.47	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.47	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	The outdoor living space, outlook space, windows to street and landscaped area standards should generally reflect the MDRS with some amendments. No additional development standards should apply.	Opposes the current lack of specific development standards for retirement villages. Under MRZ-S1 and HRZ-S1 retirement villages would be required to demonstrate the development is consistent with the Residential Design Guide under RESZ-P10, which makes no reference to retirement villages or acknowledge the differing functional and operational needs of retirement villages. Supports the development standards for retirement villages reflecting the MDRS. Suggests

				amendments are necessary to certain standards to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages. Supports the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards as they reflect the MDRS.
FS67.49	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.49	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Seeks that fit for purpose retirement village planning provisions are applied in appropriate commercial and mixed-use zones, similar to those proposed for residential zones.	Commercial and mixed use zones enable mixed uses, including residential activities, and may contain suitable sites for retirement villages. In order to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSUD, Variation 1 must provide for intensification in these zones. Supports restricted discretionary activity status for retirement villages where it is provided in the Local Centre, Mixed Use and Metropolitan Centre Zones. Restricted discretionary activity status is sought in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and the Large Format Retail Zone as well.
FS67.51	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.51	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in the submission.  [Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS67.53	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.125	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	See relief set out in relation to Variation 1 [in submission points on Variation 1].	Seeks amendments to PC19 to achieve consistency with the amendments sought to Variation 1.

FS67.127	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.126	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity.	<p>A key issue with many existing district plans is their failure to explicitly recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity. This issue has resulted in consenting challenges with members of the community, and sometimes even council officers, taking the view that retirement villages are non-residential activities that should only be provided for in non-residential zones or seeking to assess different parts of a village in a different manner (such as a commercial activity). Retirement villages are clearly a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. Retirement villages do provide a range of ancillary services, however those services are provided for residents only and complement the residential function of retirement villages by meeting the particular needs of older residents. The residential nature of retirement villages is reflected in the definition, which recognises the key function of villages as a "residential complex or facilities" for the provision of "residential accommodation for people who are retired". This recognition requires that retirement villages as a land use are a permitted activity. In line with the Enabling Housing Act, the construction of retirement villages (being four or more residential</p>

				units on a site) can be regulated as a restricted discretionary activity.
FS67.128	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
FS127.502	Rebecca Davis	Support	Allow	It is essential for FENZ to be able to access buildings and have resources available.

## 32-General > 32.22-Climate Change

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS16.4	Andrew Wellum	Not Stated	<p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, which use lightweight roofing materials to use white or silver roof colours.</p> <p>All new structures, and extensions to existing structures, to use light coloured cladding (no black or dark colours).</p>	[No specific reasons given]
OS74.33	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Include matters of control or discretion in relevant rules that considers the extent to which the development within the design will improve climate resilience.	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policies are Policy CC.4 and Policy CC.14</p> <p>In regard to scope, climate-resilient urban areas may be considered in the scope of the IPI under section 80E(2)(a) as a district-wide matter.</p>
FS17.358	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS81.57	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required on what rules are subject to the submission point and the matters of control/discretion.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the submission point. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to
OS74.36	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:</p> <p>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>Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as ‘actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....’</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p>

				In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).
FS17.361	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.37	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.7 and Policy CC.12 as follows:</p> <p>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>• direct the protection of areas that already perform a function as a nature based solution, including the many wider benefits these can have.</li> <li>• encourage the restoration of nature-based solutions.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed RPS Change 1 includes a number of provisions that recognise nature-based solutions are an integral part of the climate change mitigation and adaptation response required in the region and also provide a number of other benefits for indigenous biodiversity and community well-being. Nature-based solutions are defined as 'actions to protect, enhance or restore natural ecosystems, and the incorporation of natural elements into built environments, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and/or strengthen the resilience of humans, indigenous biodiversity and the natural environment to the effects of climate change....'</p> <p>Natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing</p>

				<p>nature based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1. The PDP goes some way to providing for nature-based solutions through soft engineering for natural hazard risks, particularly coastal hazards. Submitter supports this direction.</p> <p>In regard to scope, nature-based solutions to manage natural hazard and climate change risks are considered within the scope of the IPI as: a related provision through infrastructure under section 80(E); and a related provision through stormwater management under section 80(E).t-wide matter.</p>
FS17.362	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.38	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	<p>Amend Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 as necessary to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the type and scale of activities where reducing greenhouse gases rather than offsetting must occur.</li> <li>• Include objectives, policies, rules to require greenhouse gases to be reduced rather than offset for the type and scale of activities identified.</li> </ul>	<p>Submitter considers there is a role for additional provisions in Variation 1 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 direction in providing for urban intensification and development. The relevant Proposed RPS Change 1 policy is Policy CC.8.</p> <p>Prioritising greenhouse gas emissions reduction over offsetting – district and regional In regard to scope, infrastructure is a related matter under RMA section 80E(2)(d).</p>

FS17.363	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS81.58	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seek to be involved with the development of the policy.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the submission point. However, Waka Kotahi consider that insufficient detail is available to understand the implications of what is proposed and how it will be given effect to.



## 32-General > 32.24-Multiple Zones

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS1.1	Andrew Myers On Behalf Of Andrew Myers	Amend	That any new build or modification to any existing build requires the approval of all properties that the new build may restrict.	<p>There are a number of existing rules that were in place that allowed some properties to be 1 storey, and some 2 storeys. The proposal should just allow for the increase of one extra floor (i.e. 1 to 2 and 2 to 3), but before any modifications / new builds are initiated they need to be approved by all existing properties that will be affected by their height (e.g. building a 3 storey in front of a 2 storey house, obstructs the view, reduces the resale value, could create shadows and reduce temperature for the existing property and so forth.</p> <p>The plan needs to be modified to make sure this doesn't occur.</p> <p>A large number of people bought property specifically in an area where they were assured that there would never be a another property built taller than 1 story. This proposed plan breaches that assurance and is thus unfair and unjust.</p> <p>Submitter has no issues with this plan for completely new area, though any 3 storey property should be thoroughly earthquake resilient and perhaps all properties 3 storeys and above need an EQ assessment before building starts.</p>
FS17.4	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS2.1	Marg Pearce	Support	Strongly supports the government's direction to enable medium and possibly high density housing in Porirua City.	<p>The higher residential housing goes, the more green space remains available for native forest, green recreation areas, growing food and other aspects of healthy living.</p> <p>Accepts such increased density could occur in own neighbourhood. Others may not be as accepting but unfortunately intensification is necessary to ensure more and more green space is not lost to housing.</p>
FS17.596	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS99.13	Alan Collett	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission be disallowed.	<p>Would suggest the submitter is unaware that to allow for this high-density housing direction of the governments that a substantial amount of acreage of carbon sequestering forest is to be destroyed. Especially in the Pukerua Bay surrounding area.</p> <p>Housing intensification enablement goes against the Kiwi culture of back yards and tight knit neighborhoods as currently available to people in Pukerua Bay. It does nothing to stem the cost of housing as it is construction costs per M2 that are driving unaffordability. The changes to the RMA via the National Policy Statement on Urban Development will do nothing but enable developers to gouge profits with less restrictions put on them. We are building the ghettos of tomorrow.</p>

OS74.50	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	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>Submitter supports well-planned intensification within the existing urban footprint in appropriate areas that are not subject to a qualifying matter. This approach is consistent with Policy 31 of Proposed RPS Change 1.</p> <p>Submitter seeks for the provisions of the zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.</p>
FS17.375	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

## 32-General > 32.25-Walkable Catchment

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS38.21	Amos Mann	Amend	In regard to the HRZ, supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS56.5	John Cody	Support	Introduce a positive term that is an equivalent of 'walkable catchment' and	Supports the introduction of the concept of 'walkable catchments' . Walkable does not

			emphasises the potential advantages of increasing the number of people able to use local amenities and services.	convey the potential benefits for other aspects of mobility and accessibility. Catchment does not acknowledge the cultural challenges of greater suburban density.
FS17.645	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS60.5	Rosie Gallagher	Not Stated	In regard to the HRZ, supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.260	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS60.8	Rosie Gallagher	Not Stated	Submitter supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.263	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS64.9	Brian Warburton	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) refers to there being, "as a minimum", "good accessibility for all people [my emphasis] between housing ... community services ..." The Ministry for the Environment has produced this document, 'Understanding and implementing intensification provisions for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development' [ <a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/Understanding-and-">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/Understanding-and-</a>

				<p>implementingintensification-provisions-for-NPS-UD.pdf]</p> <p>MfE’s guidance consistently refers to a walkable distance or catchment being 800m or the equivalent of a 10-minute walkable. An 800m distance is the value being consistently adopted nation-wide. An 800m distance (relative to primary schools) is the parameter adopted by the Council in developing the extent of the intensification precincts. In this regard I refer to the following screen shot from the Council’s website. [Refer to original submission].</p> <p>As far as I know no feedback on the draft of Variation 1 to the PDP sought a wider walkable catchment relative to primary schools. The Council has produced no information to justify an expansion of the walkable distance from 800m to 1,000 metres.</p> <p>An expansion in the walkable distance from 800m to 1,000m is a significant increase in the scope of the Variation 1. It represents a significant shift in policy that has not been endorsed by the Council. It therefore cannot be considered via the current variation process. Despite this, the Council’s ‘urban design expert’ now considers an acceptable walkable distance to be 1,000 metres. The document entitled: “McIndoe Urban 2022 Urban Design Memo 20” is one of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>documents council staff suggest support the proposed variation. See:  <a href="https://porirua.govt.nz/documents/6850/McIndoe_Urban_2022_Urban_Design_Memo_20.pdf">https://porirua.govt.nz/documents/6850/McIndoe_Urban_2022_Urban_Design_Memo_20.pdf</a></p> <p>I refer to the following screen shots from that document [refer to original submission].</p> <p>An increase from 800m to 1,000m has no evidential basis. An increase from 800m to 1,000m is not part of the Council’s policy approach in response to the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Mr McIndoe’s assessment is unreliable and must be discounted.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.275	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS70.2	Paremata Residents Association	Amend	Define “walkable catchment” and apply it sensibly and reasonably to determine the areas that should be identified as MRZ – Intensification Precincts.	<p>Questions what a walkable catchment is? It is not defined in the NPS-UD. It is left to individual Councils to decide.</p> <p>A <u>walkable catchment</u> depends on the individual (age, fitness, state of health) and topography. The distance seen as reasonable on the flat/gentle slopes is much less when walking up steep slopes.</p>

				<p>The distance from the New World supermarket in Mana shopping area is approx. 1.4 kilometres to the start of Paremata Crescent. Possibly a reasonable distance for an able-bodied person to walk on the flat (provided nothing of any substance is carried). However, it is a further 800 metres up the steep winding slope of Kiriwai and Kahu Roads to the extremity of that proposed Intensification Precinct. I don't believe this can, or should be, classed as reasonable.</p> <p>The intensification Precincts proposed in Papakowhai are even further from Paremata Crescent, also up steep slopes.</p> <p>The location of Intensification Precincts has not been applied sensibly or consistently. Much of Aotea is a similar distance to the Metropolitan Zone but is not classified as a MRZ - Intensification Precinct. Plimmerton and Seaview Road are a similar distance from the Local Centre Zone but are not classified as MRZ - Intensification Precincts. No area north of Paremata Bridge (and closer to the Local Centre Zone) is identified as a MRZ - Intensification Precinct.</p> <p>Medium Density Intensification Precincts are impractical for areas of steep topography in Porirua, particularly areas with soft soils prone to slips or settlement, and cut and fill subdivisions.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

FS17.29 1	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS79.10	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	<p>Request for council to consider the following:</p> <p>(1) Walkable by who? A fit 30 year old ? A parent with a baby buggy and a five year old? An elderly person or someone with mobility issues? Someone returning from the supermarket with heavy shopping bags? The Submitter asks that the needs of all users are taken into account, especially as less provision is being made for parking of private cars in new developments.</p> <p>(2) Has topography been taken into account? With so many steep hill sites proposed for HRZ, this factor is important. Walking up or down a steep hill implies quite a different level of "walkability" than walking on the flat. Submitter further note that the walkways in the Plimmerton/Camborne area are generally steep stairways, which cannot be accessed by parents with strollers or less mobile pedestrians.</p> <p>(3) Another factor complicating the walkability and accessibility of the area is the location of safe pedestrian crossings across the rail line and a four lane State</p>	<p>Questions the "Walkable Catchment" used to set HRZ Boundaries. The Variation 1 HRZ chapter introduction states: "The High Density Residential Zone has been identified as being suitable for a high density of residential development. This zone is in areas that are within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and/or a train station. This zone will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, including high levels of accessibility to primary schools, shops and services including supermarkets, and local parks." There is no definition provided of the terms "walkable catchment" or "high levels of accessibility" which suggests the properties identified as HRZ may have been selected in an arbitrary manner.</p>



			Highway, plus the location of access routes to the station itself.  Request for Council to share the basis for setting the HRZ zone boundaries.	
FS17.428	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.375	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS81.10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Retain as notified.	Notes the criteria used for walkable catchments. Supports the walkable catchments that have determined the zones/precincts as it implements Policy 3 (d) of the NPS-UD.
FS17.1044	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS76.395	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Allow	Kāinga Ora supports this submission, to the extent that it is consistent with Kāinga Ora's primary submission
OS83.5	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs. Where a 10-minute catchment has been used or a conservative 15-minute walking catchment used (e.g. because there is a hill), this should be extended to a bold 15-minute or even a 20-minute walk.	Support larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs. [15-minute or even a 20-minute walk] is a very quick e-scooter or e-bike trip  During the transition phases, as the sector and systems gear up, we need to get as much intensification as we can that enables people to drive less. We need to enable those for whom the planets are aligning to go ahead with their development. This can

				be revisited in a few years' time if necessary, but now is the time to err on the side of more intensification.
FS17.10 90	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.14	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs. Where a 10-minute catchment has been used or a conservative 15-minute walking catchment used (e.g. because there is a hill), this should be extended to a bold 15-minute or even a 20-minute walk.	[A 15-minute or even a 20-minute walk] is a very quick e-scooter or e-bike trip.
FS17.10 99	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

## 32-General > 32.26-Approach to Intensification

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS12.1	Rosalind Hall-Jones On Behalf Of	Oppose	In relation to high density zoning for Motuhara Road property/ies, seeks feasibility study by professionals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>on environmental impact;</li> </ul>	Comments/concerns raised in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steep topography and soil type (clay).</li> <li>Land eroding and land stability.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• existing vegetation;</li> <li>• geographical suitability eg, stability, steepness, drainage and water overflow, soil type, expansive clay;</li> <li>• infrastructure such as current water and sewage system capability to handle higher density (age and location); and</li> <li>• whoever else is needed to determine the practicality and issues of high density buildings in this location.</li> </ul> <p>An assessment by a geo-engineer on the current stability of Motuhara Road itself and on the steep bank below and on the capability of the road to structurally manage any increase in traffic, and car parking. As this zone is designed to be close to transport systems there may be very little if any increase – but the demand and capability still needs to be determined not assumed.</p> <p>Determination of the increased shading effects of the height of the buildings as the road is steep which effectively increases the shading effect on the buildings down slope.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slips resulting from last rainfall.</li> <li>• A few years ago the road was subsiding in the middle and needed repair.</li> <li>• Wear and tear on road since large heavy trucks allowed to use Motuhara Road. Ability of road to manage the current traffic loading and further increase.</li> <li>• Rain causes slips and overflow down the properties.</li> <li>• Old age of waste water and sewage pipes and have broken several times already. They drain steeply down to the back of the property by the school.</li> <li>• Sections initially meant to have two houses on them but this was apparently abandoned when it was determined that they could not provide adequate infrastructure for the volume of waste needed.</li> <li>• Could be similar problems with the increased length, and the siting of the tap water pipes to provide the volume of water needed.</li> <li>• Two storey houses in the street already cause some shading on neighboring houses. Houses are close to each and at a significant slope - what would be the shading effect of 6 storeyed multi buildings on one section?</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

				[Refer to original submission for full reason]
OS17.3	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission].	<p>Feedback on the following topics;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insertion of the medium-density residential standards (with some modifications) into all residential zones.</li> <li>2. Identification of qualifying matters which modify the medium density residential standards in some areas.</li> <li>3. Creation of a new residential chapter containing mandatory objectives and consequential policies.</li> </ol> <p>Opposed to this form of building. Knows of people in Lower Hutt who are experiencing this form of building firsthand. Photos provided of what medium-density housing looks like. Two houses were purchased and demolished to erect 21 medium-density houses. Opposed to this form of intensive housing with such limited scope of what the consequences are for the neighbours, the whenua (Land) and the flora and fauna that this form of building ignores. In the identified case, an old Totara tree was cut down and disposed of without consideration for the Piwakawaka that lived in that tree and with zero regard for recycling such old and rare wood, which ended up at the dump.</p> <p>While this doesn't have any relevance to building houses in Porirua, it does have relevance to the impact on the people and land. Jamming these types of houses into existing neighbourhoods is an act of futility</p>

				<p>and highlights the council's shortsightedness toward long-term problems. If this form of construction is allowed to occur in areas like Plimmerton Farms the environmental impact would be disastrous for the native land, birds, flora, fauna, and people. This is a great opportunity that PCC has to create housing, in harmony, with the land. Imagine if the council took the initiative and approved a plan for Plimmerton Farms that worked with the area as opposed to the pictures above and not just jamming people into houses for more rates money. While these problems are not new and include the added effects of more people, more cars, reduced green space, impacted shared community areas, increased sewerage operations (which currently can't cope now) and depleted resources which again are not new problems. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create a community that is future-proofed for all generations.</p> <p>In conclusion, the submitter is opposed to medium-density construction in existing neighbourhoods and Plimmerton Farms.</p>
FS17.38	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS19.2	Tim Goode	Support	[Not specified, refer to original submission].	New suburbs – say Plimmerton Farm - no problem at all for Medium Density, where those who choose to buy or build will understand the nature of the suburb they

				will be buying into and can decide to live there or not. Existing rules stay for existing, new rules for new.
FS17.599	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS19.3	Tim Goode	Oppose	Objects to the Medium Density Standards being rolled out across the remaining existing suburbs and would like to see the protections within General Residential Zoning kept for these.	The nature of the suburbs will be able to be changed too much beyond what residents anticipated when they purchased their homes in these places. Certainly feels this way about Plimmerton. Already have three and perhaps some four storey dwellings here, but their appropriateness was scrutinized at the time they were being consented, for a cost in both money and time yes, but the results and appropriateness of these speaks to the process. Does not know to what extent PCC's hands are tied on this by central government legislation, but if there is flexibility allowed then the submitter would like to oppose these changes to the above.
FS17.600	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS23.6	James Baigent	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	In regard to general housing intensification, supports two storied housing with at least three meters from the boundary with exceptions for where appropriate mitigations are in place such as three story town houses adjacent to commercial areas.
OS25.1	John O'Connell	Oppose	In regard to the High Density Residential Zone in Plimmerton and Mana, remove the	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as high density housing will

			High Density zoning completely from the whole area.	severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m height is too high and not needed. The 1m boundary seriously impinges on home dwellers privacy and causes shading, potentially leading to health problems. There will be adverse environmental and social effects, including loss of sun, privacy, shading, and loss of property values.
FS17.41	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS29.2	Andy Brown	Oppose	Start again. Drastically reduce the scale of this to "urban" areas, not to the whole of Porirua.	According to the council, they need to "enable medium-density (3 storey) housing in all residential areas in Porirua." This directive may come from central government, but it is ludicrous in extreme. Porirua is not a major urban centre, and contains a wide variety of residential development. A "one size fits all" approach to the whole city is insanity. This has to be restricted to fewer areas than it is now. The council also say they are required to identify urban areas where even taller buildings can be built such as within the city centre, local centres and commercial areas, and within walking distance of the city centre, public transport stops and local centres. The current proposals are ludicrous in their extent. The potential impact of this on many residences is enormous. To find that your neighbour has developed a 6 storey building next to your existing single storey building, without there being any

				concern for the impact on your aspect, light, privacy and warmth is possibly the most ridiculous proposal the submitter has ever heard.
FS17.51	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS34.1	Matthew Xuereb	Oppose	Remove zoning for six storey housing (800m wide circumference from Plimmerton Station)	<p>Motuhara road is built on matter that is not suitable for this kind of structure. Also the building platforms sit at the top of a very small ridge with minimal room for building a house, for example the submitter's house depth from front to back is less than 10m. Submitter's father-in-law (Emeritus Professor Vincent Neall) who is a renowned soilscientist and Geologist. Not only does he believe the soil/clay that our houses are built on is not suitable for such high dwellings this has been backed up in recent weeks by slips across the road. If the road is falling away how could this support the type of housing in this plan?</p> <p>Then take into account the wind, these houses are already on the higher edge of wind scales in LIM reports so 6 storeys would be much worse. Then there's parking...which there is none of on the road. As is often the case with PCC this is a blanket policy without considering the intricacies, 800m from a train station is a crazy measurement when you consider the topography of Wellington. Each station should be appraised separately. Think of</p>



				Pukerua Bay, that's an even worse case than Plimmerton.
FS17.83	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS38.12	Amos Mann	Not Stated	In regard to the MRZ, submitter supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
OS39.1	Madeleine Waters	Oppose	<p>In relation to High and Medium Density Residential Zone in Plimmerton and Camborne, suggests the following changes to the proposals in Plimmerton and Camborne due to flood, coastal erosion and land slip risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the status quo for all coastal sites, Steyne Avenue, Sunset Parade, Moana Road etc until management of the coastal hazards is addressed (this aligns to the KCDC's approach)</li> <li>• Maintain the status quo for all sites around Palmers Garden Centre, St Theresa's School, Airlie Road and any other areas that are a high flood risk (as evidenced by flood events in recent years)</li> <li>• Reduce the zoning to medium density (or status quo) around Motuhara Road, Pope Street, Taupo Crescent and Grays Road where the topography is steep.</li> </ul>	<p>The planned changes to high density do not appear to have considered the steep nature of these areas and the practicality of building six storeys in areas that are prone to land slips (there have been several in Motuhara Road, Cluny Road...).</p> <p>Flood, coastal erosion and land slip risk</p>

FS17.87	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS120.5	Baswa Surukanti	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>
OS39.2	Madeleine Waters	Oppose	In relation to High and Medium Density Residential Zones and subdivisions, e.g. Whitby – Silverwood and the Banks, Aotea, seeks that the subdivision design requirements submitter had to follow, and covenants on their titles should continue to take precedence over the changes.	Submitter built home in a subdivision where required to adhere to the Developer's Design Guidelines and accordingly there are covenants on title. The requirements they legally have to follow should continue to take precedence over the proposed changes. Submitter paid a premium to build and live in an area that had design guidelines and rules for the development of all the sites in the subdivision. Submitter hugely values the outside space and rural outlook that they have. Submitter purposely chose not to live in a densely populated city environment and worked hard to achieve the home they have.

FS17.88	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS93.2	Alfaaz Lateef	Oppose	Request that the submission be disallowed and covenants either be varied or removed completely (from Whitby, Banks, Navigation Drive), to allow for further subdivision on existing sections to build more than one dwelling per council guidelines. As allowing this submission only benefits the submitter and not other individuals who would like to further intensify housing on their sections given its size.	Opposes old and restricted existing covenants that are in place that restricts housing intensifications, even though if sections in areas of Whitby, Aotea, Banks and Silverwood allows for further housing intensification on a single section, which can be further subdivided given its large unused section size.
FS120.4	Baswa Surukanti	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Zealand has a shortage of affordable housing. The main drivers of this shortage is restrictive planning rules and density of housing.</li> <li>• Keep Medium density zone to Aotea new subdivisions. This will enable more homes to built in the area which have good</li> <li>• access to jobs, public transport and other public amenities.</li> <li>• Enable young generation to have access to housing with more land availability</li> <li>• Lived in Aotea and the know the area very well. it has everything it need to be in medium density zone demographics wise.</li> <li>• The new subdivision of Aotea in the northern corner is approximately 15 mins walk to porirua station and 20 mins walk</li> <li>• porirua city centre</li> <li>• Land is scarce resource and here in wellington we are not left with much of land anymore for new builds.</li> <li>• Eases housing pressure.</li> </ul>
OS40.1	Ian Baxter	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Supports in principle the objective of encouraging higher density housing along transport corridors.
FS17.91	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS40.2	Ian Baxter	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Concerned about the proposals for Plimmerton HRZ and MRZ Zones.</p> <p>In relation to Sunset Parade and Moana Road:</p> <p>The designation of Sunset Parade and Moana Road as HRZ and MRZ zones is unwise. Not enough consideration has been given to the existing hazards or the effect of climate change. These roads are in the Tsunami zone and also will be affected by sea level rise within the next 50 years. Increasing housing density in this area will make managed retreat, if required, more difficult and expensive.</p> <p>In relation to Motuhara Road:</p> <p>The section of Motuhara Road between School Road and Corlett Road is narrow and has been subject to slips. A large one a few years ago near School Road and more recently there have been two slips on the Western Side of Motuhara Road one of them undermining the road. This road is not suitable to provide access for both the construction of the new buildings and the increased number residents in the High and Medium density areas in Motuhara Road, The Track, and Corlett Road.</p> <p>The zoning on the East side of Motuhara Road between number 20 and 58 as HRZ is</p>
--------	------------	------------	---	--

				<p>unlikely to be effective. All these sections except one have a narrow frontage of about 12 metres and there is very limited ability to put multiple dwellings on these sections. The back part of these sections are all steep. The Plimmerton School Bush SNA039 also limits the amount of space available for additional dwellings. Preserving SNAs has a higher priority than increasing housing density. The likely outcome of this change in zone is that there will be bigger houses in this area but not more houses.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.92	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS60.1	Rosie Gallagher	Not Stated	In regard to Medium Density Residential Zones, increase height limits in the 15-minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Submitter considers that there is a need to enable larger, more comprehensive developments in centres. Submitter supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs.
FS17.256	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS61.1	David Carter	Oppose	That the proposed High Density Residential Zone and all the relevant rules and standards does not apply and is uplifted from all the residential areas of the suburb of Plimmerton, as shown on relevant Planning Maps.	Notwithstanding the directions of Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development the Porirua City Council has a discretion as to the extent to which High Density Residential Zone provisions apply. It is considered that the application of High

				<p>Density Residential Zone provisions to the suburb of Plimmerton are inappropriate for the following reasons;</p> <p>i With regard to the suburb of Plimmerton Residential High Density provisions would result in residential development that would be incompatible with the existing built environment, and exacerbate existing flood risk.</p> <p>ii With regard to the suburb of Plimmerton existing infrastructure, both roading and services, do not have sufficient capacity to provide for the intensification of residential activity that the High Density Residential Zone would permit.</p> <p>iii With regard to the property at 5C Motuhara Road, Plimmerton High Density Residential Zone Rules and Standards would permit developments on adjoining residential sites which would significantly reduce the enjoyment of the property in the following ways; loss of coastal views, loss of privacy, shading, and loss of daylight.</p> <p>iv With regard to the proposed High Density provisions, including the proposed new Rules and Standards, combined with the additional overlay of the Sites and Areas of Significance, in particular SASM17, and SASM 0223 in relation to our property at 5C Motuhara Road, there will be significant</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>equity considerations for residential property owners. This is because a number of residential properties in Plimmerton where the SASM notation overlay will apply would have considerably reduced development/redevelopment potential than those properties subject to High Density Rules and Standards. This is because of the reduced maximum height, and recession planes, under the SASM overlay. Applying Medium Density Residential Standards to all residential properties in Plimmerton, with no required overlays would be a much fairer, and more equitable approach.</p> <p>v With regard to the properties along Plimmerton foreshore in the High Density Residential Zone that have been identified on PCC coastal/tsunami hazard maps as being at risk of rising sea levels be changed to Medium Density Residential Zone or be zoned for no increase in density. As allowing these properties to be zoned as High Density Residential contradicts the PCC coastal/tsunami hazard maps and will expose more properties to the issues of rising sea levels/flooding.</p>
FS17.264	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS63.1	Jim Marsden	Amend	In regard to the zoning map for Plimmerton, amend to MRZ	The sudden jump to 6 stories would cause too much shading, to existing houses and the beach. It would be better to stagger the

				growth back from the beach until the other side of the railway line.
FS17.266	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.2	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	Preliminary feedback provided on the Porirua City Council's draft variation. That feedback, alongside the submitter's response to Council's request for further information, explains why MDRS standards in close proximity to its transmission infrastructure are inappropriate.
FS17.311	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.3	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	That the Council have regard to the submitter's Facilities, as a lifeline utility, in a way that ensures RNZ can continue to undertake daily operations, maintenance and upgrades of its facilities as required.	[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.312	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS74.74	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend to avoid zoning of High Density Residential within stream corridors and amend to aa more appropriate zoning, such as open space.	In accordance with a risk-based framework, zoning for high density residential use should be avoided in stream corridors (where there is a significant risk to life and property). This request is sought by Submitter to ensure the District Plan has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 29.
FS17.399	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.



FS32.55	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 74 of OS74	We support zoning of High Density Residential within stream corridors.  Avoiding significant risk to life and property.
FS76.387	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing hazards. However, the natural hazard risk-based provisions can appropriately manage development in areas prone to hazard, rather than altering the underlying zone.
FS118.139	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow. The RVA requests the amendment to not be included.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
OS74.75	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Amend	Amend to avoid zoning of Medium Density Residential within stream corridor and amend to a more appropriate zoning, such as open space.	In accordance with a risk-based framework, zoning for high density residential use should be avoided in stream corridors (where there is a significant risk to life and property). This request is sought by Submitter to ensure the District Plan has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 29.
FS17.400	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.56	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 75 of OS74	Support amending zoning to avoid medium density residential within stream corridors.  Avoiding significant risk to life and property. Open space designation would be more appropriate for stream corridors.
FS76.388	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing hazards. However, the natural hazard risk-based provisions can appropriately manage development in

				areas prone to hazard, rather than altering the underlying zone.
FS118.140	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Disallow. The RVA requests the amendment to not be included.	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
OS79.9	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Concerns raised regarding the blanket application of the High Density Zone (HRZ) under provisions for distances from public transport, supermarkets etc. While recognising the need for additional housing to meet population growth, questions the effectiveness of rezoning many existing areas of Plimmerton/Camborne to HRZ to achieve this because:</p> <p>(1) there are already three significant areas of greenfield growth bordering Plimmerton identified in the Growth Strategy (Plimmerton Farm, Pukerua Bay and Gray Farm), projected to add over 3,000 households. Kāinga Ora has also recently proposed using a Specified Development Project approach (supported by PCC and Ngāti Toa) to accelerate an extension of development for the area south of Pukerua Bay, including the Plimmerton Farm site, which will increase the 3,000 to somewhere in the region of 6,000 additional households for the area overall;</p> <p>(2) very few of the properties identified for HRZ rezoning in existing parts of Plimmerton/Camborne should be developed as high density complexes</p>

				<p>because of coastal hazard or natural hazard overlays, topography or site instability. If the areas apart from coastal or natural hazard are given blanket approval for 6 storey developments the result is likely to be tall buildings 'pepper potted' around thereby maximising likely impacts like shading and oppressive bulk alongside lower height dwellings. Submitter suggests better functional, liveability and design outcomes would be achieved by restricting buildings taller than 3 storeys to clusters in more suitable sites where appropriate infrastructure, accessibility and community facilities can be established in a planned manner; and</p> <p>(3) in respect of sites immediately bordering the coast and flood prone areas, it would now be simply irrational to allow significant development under the HRZ provisions of the Act / NPS-UD. It would also seem to be at odds with the directives of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010. PCC has been proactive in wisely deciding to prepare the way for retreat from some low-lying areas. This decision should be strengthened by ensuring that PCC strongly recommends excluding these areas from any HRZ.</p> <p>Many of the properties designated as HRZ in Plimmerton/Camborne are located on or abutting steep hillsides. While lot sizes may</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>appear large on a planning map there is little flat land available for building, and significant earthworks and retention would be required to excavate and stabilise sites for larger buildings. We note that these areas are already known for land instability and consider the risk of undertaking such major earthworks unacceptable.</p> <p>Properties on Plimmerton's waterfront in South Beach Rd, Steyne Avenue, Beach Rd, Sunset Parade and Moana Rd have been proposed for HRZ rezoning. The latest NZ SeaRise report (<a href="https://www.searise.nz">https://www.searise.nz</a>) predicts the acceleration of climate change effects in this area with sea level rise compounded by vertical land movement. On top of this, we are experiencing severe storm surge effects more frequently, and there is already discussion of insurers refusing cover for affected properties. It therefore seems ill-advised for council to be proposing further intensification of buildings in this fragile area. While the hazard overlays do provide for consent triggers, it would seem far more sensible to avoid the cost and work involved in the consent process in the first place by removing HRZ designations on these properties. Other HRZ areas such as James Street have already experienced significant flood events with significant consequences for residents. Again, these areas are marked as flood or stream hazards on the planning</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				maps, and therefore should not be considered for inclusion in the HRZ.
FS17.427	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.374	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS79.11	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	Seeks that the circumstances and rights of existing property owners and residents are better recognised and reflected in the PDP. Perhaps some distinction might be made between greenfields development and intensification in existing suburban areas.	<p>While the planned form of a “greenfields” HRZ could allow for the application of design standards and the coordinated development of a common high-rise built form, the proposal to “pepper-pot” these structures into an existing suburban landscape does not.</p> <p>Particularly concerned about the effects of shading and loss of privacy on existing properties in the proposed HRZ, with 22 metre buildings able to extend to a metre of site boundaries. While some height controls are being proposed for south facing sloped sites, there is no protection for other existing properties that could be hemmed in by six storey buildings on three sides.</p> <p>For existing residents these major changes could destroy their enjoyment of their homes and result in negative impacts on their physical and mental health. This consequence is at odds with the objective of clause UFD-07 which states “A well-functioning urban environment that</p>

				<p>enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.”</p> <p>It would currently seem that the Mungavin netball courts are of more concern to council than the future health and wellbeing of existing residents and ratepayers.</p>
FS17.429	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.376	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS79.16	Plimmerton Residents' Association	Not Stated	Reconsider the HRZ zoning decision in Plimmerton and Cambourne.	[Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.434	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo’s and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS127.381	Rebecca Davis	Support	Submitter seeks that the whole submission be allowed.	Development should only occur when infrastructure can cope. Environment must be protected.
OS80.1	Robin and Russell Jones On Behalf Of Robin Jones	Oppose	Submitter opposes the proposal, in all existing suburban areas of Porirua, to implement HRZ to allow 22 metre high buildings to be constructed within one metre of the boundary of existing one or two level dwellings without consideration of the impacts (especially the loss of sunlight and privacy) on adjacent properties. The PDP should provide greater protection for the health and well-being of	While a greenfields HRZ development can allow for adjacent buildings of similar size to be planned synergistically to complement each other with orientation and design, there is no opportunity to do that when large buildings, out of context with their neighbours, are pepper-potted in established areas.

			existing residents when such infill developments are being considered.	
FS17.435	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS80.2	Robin and Russell Jones On Behalf Of Robin Jones	Oppose	Submitter opposes the inclusion of fragile coastal areas and flood prone areas in the HRZ zone.	PCC should take into account the current and future impact of adverse weather events, climate change and rising sea levels.
FS17.436	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS80.3	Robin and Russell Jones On Behalf Of Robin Jones	Oppose	Submitter opposes the HRZ zoning in Variation 1 for Taupō Crescent, Plimmerton and Lagden Street, Camborne.	<p>(i) Site Instability: These streets are on a steep hillside which has proven issues with instability as evidenced by previous section subsidence and several significant slip events. These areas would be at increased risk of slippage and runoff sedimentation if significant earthworks were undertaken to build larger buildings. If large buildings are established with no limit on site coverage there will be less permeable surfaces to absorb runoff and less vegetation to protect the land form. With the likelihood of more significant rain events due to climate change, the situation will only get worse.</p> <p>(ii) Accessibility: Submitter queries the assessment of Taupō Crescent and Lagden Street as being in a walkable catchment to a range of facilities, and they are certainly not universally accessible because of the steep terrain. The connecting walkways involve hundreds of steps and cannot be used by</p>

				<p>anyone with mobility issues, or those carrying shopping, pushing a baby buggy, cycling or scootering. There is no public transport in this area apart from the train and there is no bus to connect to the station. On a fine day it is a brisk 10-15 minute walk for an able-bodied person downhill to the station, longer on the return journey uphill. Many people who walk choose to use their cars in wet weather and in winter during the shortened hours of daylight. The current access to the station via the Plimmerton Domain does not feel safe after dark, especially for women. It is well over 15 minutes walk down to the supermarket on Mana Esplanade and to Plimmerton School, even longer on the return journey uphill. Another point to note is that what appears to be the shortest route may require using steps (not universally accessible) or backtracking to cross the four lane SH59/St Andrews Rd at a safe crossing point.</p> <p>(iii) Ageing infrastructure: The pipes in this area date back to the 1960s and are already subject to regular callouts to PCC and Wellington Water for leaks and breakages. They are barely coping with the current load and are not suitable for multiple new connections that intensification would bring.</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				(iv) Wildlife: While submitter is not aware of an SNA in this area, the established trees provide food, roosts and flight corridors for many bird species. The active Pest Free group in this area and local residents have done an amazing job in pest reduction and our gardens are alive with tui, piwakawaka, silvereye, grey warblers, kereru, kingfishers and even the occasional morepork. The removal of existing trees for major developments will impact negatively on the native wildlife in the whole area and will do nothing to improve the region's carbon footprint.
FS17.437	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS83.6	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned, make universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]
FS17.1091	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS83.11	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Height limits increased in the 15-minute walking catchments to rail of Kenepuru, Paremata, Mana, Plimmerton, and Pukerua Bay.	Need to enable larger, more comprehensive developments in our centres. The Eastern Porirua precinct is the only one where there are higher medium-density developments envisaged. This is precluding a lot of valuable missing middle housing from being provided in our city's existing centres.
FS17.1096	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.

OS85.4	Metlifecare Limited	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Supports Medium and High Density Residential zoning to enable higher density development across the district and meet the growing demand for housing.</p> <p>The amendments sought are to ensure that the Proposed Plan: (a) will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD; (b) will contribute to well-functioning urban environments; (c) is consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles of the RMA; (d) will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA; (e) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and (f) is consistent with sound resource management practice.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.441	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS96.1	Joy and Francis Herbert On Behalf Of Frank	Not Stated	Seeks a 3 storey maximum height limit (i.e. 11m maximum height limit) for 190A St Andrews Rd, Plimmerton.	This height limit is suitable, it means people in this area won't be affected by shading from tall buildings.
FS17.1114	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS97.1	Fiona Reid	Oppose	In relation to High Density Residential Zone in Plimmerton and Mana, seeks to remove the high density zoning completely from	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as they will severely impact the whole Mana and Plimmerton suburbs. The 22m is too high and not needed. Six storey

		<p>many areas indicated, especially where existing houses are already.</p>	<p>buildings will destroy the Plimmerton village heritage and community vibe. It will create a lack of privacy, loss of sun for existing properties.</p> <p>Proposed HDRS Zone is next to busy SH59 on one side and James Street on another. Already seeing increased truck traffic choosing not to use TG route to save on fuel costs. James Street is too narrow at the Plimmerton roundabout end. This will create safety issues to residents at any high rise buildings and the school children. Parking is already an issue at school drop off/collection, funerals and church activities.</p> <p>With reference to Variation 1 - High Density Residential Zone at Plimmerton and Mana raises comments/concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for high density housing in the areas indicated.</li> <li>• The 22m height is too high and not needed.</li> <li>• The 1m boundary seriously impinges on home dwellers privacy.</li> <li>• Adverse impact including sun loss, privacy, property values.</li> <li>• Health and safety - more cars, no car parks, existing houses could be bought by developers and pulled down.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22m high rises rebuilt without consultation.</li> </ul>
FS17.471	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS101.4	Melissa Story	Not Stated	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	<p>Supports increased density of housing in a defined radius of city infrastructure and town centre. That radius does depend on the location and it makes sense for it to be closer to the Porirua Centre (e.g. such as Kenepuru).</p> <p>In Plimmerton (with Porirua being the city centre), you need to acknowledge that the community reside here for a lifestyle that is close to nature. Not city dwellers. There are larger sections and an abundance of land here and therefore the three story rule could be applied to preserve natural beauty and local tourism for walkways, family trips etc. Applying the six story rule here would ruin local tourism and Plimmerton and its surrounds would become Wellington's "Gold Coast". Tacky and once done, you can't erase it.</p>
FS17.1118	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS106.1	Michael Kearns	Oppose	Remove the high-density zoning completely from many of the areas indicated [Plimmerton and Mana], especially where existing houses are already.	Strongly opposes the proposed plan changes as sees no need for high housing density in the areas indicated.

				<p>The 22m height is too high and not needed.</p> <p>The 1m boundary seriously impinges on home dwellers privacy and causes shading, potentially leading to health problems.</p> <p>There will be adverse environmental and social effects, including loss of sun, privacy, shading, and loss of property values.</p> <p>Health and safety issues:</p> <p>Safety for children coming and going to local schools with more cars parked on the roads. Stress for existing homes owners with the fear that developers can buy existing houses, tear them down and build 22m high buildings with no consultation.</p>
FS17.511	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS107.2	Wallace Richard and Helen Ann Webber On Behalf Of Wallace (Rick) Webber	Oppose	[Not specified, refer to original submission]	Does not support Variation 1 as it exacerbates the points made about 14 metre height limits. Any intensification would require very sensitive planning so individual and community living is enhanced. The city centre would seem to offer a rationale and opportunity for increased densification.
FS17.520	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS117.1	Margaret Medlyn	Oppose	With regard to Seaview Road, Paremata, strongly object to change to medium density housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peninsula is an area of natural beauty containing reserves and has plenty of houses on it already.</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road is effectively a single lane road and trucks and deliveries have enough trouble getting through and turning as it is.</li> <li>• The sewage system keeps blocking and overflowing and has done so for years - it cannot sustain more households.</li> <li>• The people on the east side of the road have little enough sun as it is. More houses would block that sunlight.</li> <li>• The transport options are not great. It takes 25 mins to walk to the station.</li> </ul>
FS17.594	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS117.2	Margaret Medlyn	Not Stated	Keep medium density housing near the citycentre in the inner suburbs, and nearer the stations.	Understand that some areas need medium density housing.
FS17.595	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS118.9	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Seeks national consistency in the planning regimes for retirement villages through the intensification planning instruments required under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Enabling Housing Act).	National consistency will greatly assist with streamlining and making more efficient, the delivery of retirement villages across New Zealand.
FS67.11	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	

OS118.18	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Not Stated	Provide for change to existing urban environments in order to achieve the intensification envisaged in Policy 3 of the NPSUD. Explicitly acknowledge that the functional and operational needs of retirement villages are a driver of appropriate and necessary change because of demographic ageing and the increasing housing needs of older people.	<p>In order to respond to the significant issues created by the retirement housing and care crisis.</p> <p>There are key differences between retirement villages and ‘typical’ residential dwellings. These differences mean that retirement villages do change the existing urban environments that are dominated by ‘typical’ dwellings, and this has not been acknowledged properly in planning frameworks leading to a range of consenting challenges. Because of their functional and operational needs, retirement village and aged care facilities tend to be larger (in height and bulk) than ‘typical’ residential housing in order to properly cater for resident needs. Retirement villages contain a range of unit types to cater for the different care and mobility needs of the residents. The accommodation ranges from independent townhouses and apartments, through to serviced apartments, hospital beds and dementia rooms. While independent living villas, townhouses and apartments will include full kitchens, bathrooms, lounges and other household amenities, serviced apartments and care rooms will not always have these amenities. These factors may be a key driver for the layout and amenities within a unit and also within a village. For example, serviced apartments and care rooms need to have quick, accessible, and</p>
----------	---	------------	--	--

				<p>all weather access to communal living and dining areas. In the experience of RVA members', council officers often attempt to redesign village layouts based on what they think might be suitable, without proper knowledge of villages and residents' needs. Retirement villages often include a wide range of amenities and services for resident needs and convenience. Services range from communal indoor and outdoor amenity areas, gardens, pools, gyms, libraries, reflection spaces, hairdressing services and cafés and bars through to welfare and medical facilities. These are important amenities and services as many retirement village residents are frail or have mobility restrictions (making it more difficult for them to travel to access amenities and services). They also provide a better quality of life for residents than could be offered without these communal amenities and services. For example, a townhouse would not have space for a pool or gym. Retirement villages also use new, low maintenance building products and design techniques to ensure their efficient operation. These design requirements can result in change when compared to surrounding neighbourhoods that were built many decades in the past. Communities (particularly neighbouring landowners seeking to preserve status quo interests) and council officers often can have an expectation as to how sites are</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>going to be used. Typically, that expectation is not for medium or higher density retirement accommodation. In part, this is because, traditionally, planning provisions have ignored the unique features of retirement villages. Further, the significant positive effects and community benefits of retirement villages are sometimes not given sufficient weight. The failure of district plans to recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and provide for change to the character and amenity of existing neighbourhoods to enable the benefits of retirement villages, has created significant consenting challenges. The NPSUD now requires district plans to provide for this change to existing urban environments. It creates an expectation that “New Zealand’s urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations” (Objective 4). Further, the NPSUD recognises that amenity values can differ among people and communities, and also recognises that changes can be made via increased and varied housing densities and types, noting that changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect (Policy 6). The importance of this direction is also clearly set out in the Ministry for the Environment’s (MfE) and the Ministry of Housing and Urban</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				Development's (HUD) final decisions report on the NPSUD. The Enabling Housing Act further supports this need for change by enabling medium density housing to be developed as a minimum in all relevant residential zones. Although the MDRS generally captures retirement villages under the umbrella of residential activities, the framework fails to recognise the unique operational, functional and locational features of retirement villages. Specific provision is therefore necessary to enable much needed retirement housing and care.
FS67.20	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
OS118.46	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	The outdoor living space, outlook space, windows to street and landscaped area standards should generally reflect the MDRS with some amendments. No additional development standards should apply.	Opposes the current lack of specific development standards for retirement villages. Under MRZ-S1 and HRZ-S1 retirement villages would be required to demonstrate the development is consistent with the Residential Design Guide under RESZ-P10, which makes no reference to retirement villages or acknowledge the differing functional and operational needs of retirement villages. Supports the development standards for retirement villages reflecting the MDRS. Suggests amendments are necessary to certain standards to reflect the particular characteristics of retirement villages. Supports the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards as they reflect the MDRS.

FS67.48	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Support	Submitter requests point be allowed.	
---------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------	--

## 32-General > 32.27-Qualifying Matters

Point No	Submitter	Position	Decision Requested	Reasons
OS53.2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	[Refer to original submission for full decision requested]	<p>Sections 77I and 77O of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (“the RMA”) provides a specified territorial authority may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under Policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to a qualifying matter. A qualifying matter is defined by section 77I and 77O of the RMA.</p> <p>The National Grid Corridor rules framework clearly meets the definition of a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD);</li> <li>• It is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure;</li> <li>• Provisions that restrict development in relation to the National Grid are included in the Operative District Plan; and</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provisions that would protect the National Grid from inappropriate subdivision, use and development that would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS are included in the proposed district plan.</li> </ul> <p>Submission includes an assessment (as required by section 77K(1)) to support the incorporation of the National Grid Corridors as an existing qualifying matter in the IPI.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>
FS17.613	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS64.2	Brian Warburton	Amend	<p>Seeks that the provisions of Variation 1 require amendment, so the proposed height and density requirements do not apply to specific land as outlined in submission [refer to submission].</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments where relevant]</p>	<p>The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 ('the Amendment Act') introduced into the principal act the concept of 'Qualifying Matters'. The concept of qualifying matters only applies to land that is "within a residential zone". Section 77I allows the Council to draft Medium Density Residential Standards in Variation 1 that are less enabling for development. The Qualifying Matters are listed in s.77I (a) to (h).</p> <p>Variation 1, as it is currently drafted, does not apply the exclusions provided for in Section 77I. Nor does the Council explain why those exclusions have not been</p>

				<p>applied. Instead, it appears the council officers are suggesting that the trade-off between enabling development, and recognising and protecting the high-level matters listed in Section 77I, can be happily left until the resource consent stage.</p> <p>I object to this approach as it will invariably lead to key environmental values being denigrated. Because, unfortunately this is what has happened in the past.</p> <p>Council Officers' Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation 1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. The council officers' comment about my feedback indicates they consider the use of the Qualifying Matters provisions of the Amendment Act is not necessary because (they think) the provisions of the PDP already sufficiently address such matters as natural hazards, coastal environment, ecosystems and biodiversity, historic heritage and cultural sites.</p> <p>My Counter Argument. I acknowledge that the PDP includes provisions relative to those resource management issues the council officer has noted. But inclusion and adequacy are two different things.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>The points, which council officers have overlooked, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The PDP is still a proposed district plan, decisions on submissions have not yet been made, and submitters on the PDP have the option of appealing unfavourable decisions to the Environment Court.</li><li>• Because the PDP (that part of it already heard) is still only 'proposed' it's not possible to know what its substance will eventually entail.</li><li>• Because submitters don't know what the substance of the PDP will be they don't know how the PDP will integrate with the Variation 1 provisions.</li><li>• Because submitters don't know how the PDP and the Variation 1 will integrate it is impossible for participants to make submissions with any confidence about the plan provisions necessary to achieve the proposed of the Act.</li><li>• The only way submitters can have confidence that the purpose of the Act will be achieved [once the Variation 1 provisions (yet to be determined) are integrated within the PDP provisions (also yet to be determined)] is for the Variation 1 provisions to include Qualifying</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Matters and for those to relate to the resource management issues referred to this submission.</p> <p>I ask the Council to consider this dilemma with which submitters are now faced. When submitters submitted on the PDP they knew nothing about the extent to which the Council would apply the intensification provisions of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. It appears council officers are suggesting that submitters (when they submitted on the PDP) should have known what the Council would propose in terms of residential building height and coverage as a consequence of Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Submissions on the PDP closed on 20 November 2020. The Council's draft of the variation to give effect to the Amendment Act was released for stakeholder comment in April 2022. Submitters on the PDP could not have possibly known or envisaged what Variation 1 would comprise. For example, when stakeholders submitted on the PDP they could not have possibly known that the Council would be proposing such things as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• five storey residential buildings in an area (eg: Titahi Bay) where the</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>wastewater network is already defective and unlawful; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new high density residential development in parts of the city subject to significant natural hazard risks, and/or valued for its significant natural character relating to the coastal environment.</li> </ul> <p>If submitters on the PDP had known then, what they know now, submissions would likely have been substantially different. Similarly, all experts (for all participants) who have so far contributed to the PDP process were, when they prepared their technical assessments and evaluation, looking at the environment in the context of the PDP as it was notified. They weren't looking at the environment in the context of the PDP but as modified by Variation 1. Indeed, it was impossible for them to have done so. This has obvious consequences for the scope of the district plan provisions. For example, it is quite possible that experts dealing with the ecosystem and biodiversity provisions (if they had assessed the potential implications of 22m high buildings when they considered the provisions of the PDP) would have recommended no-building buffers around the permittees of SNAs relating to shade intolerant plants. Or in other words, if a SNA contains shade intolerant plants (with significant biodiversity values) then provisions to</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>manage effects from building shading would be different if buildings were 22m and not 8 metres</p> <p>But, those ecological experts wouldn't have been thinking about this as a resource management issue/tool, because the concept of 22m high buildings in the residential area was not known to them. There are numerous other examples, where the outcome (in terms of submissions, experts' contribution and assessment, and the Panel's questioning and consideration) could likely have been substantially different if the consequences of the Variation 1 were known during the PDP submission and hearing process. Site coverage (and its potential effects on catchment hydrology due to changes in the proportion of ground capable of infiltration) is another one such example. It is quite likely experts dealing with the hydrological and ecological effects due to impervious surfaces in any particular catchment (when considering the provisions of the PDP) had not looked at the potential implications of more than 50% percent of land area being covered by impervious surfaces. If they had had that option they may well have recommended plan provisions different from what is now proposed with the PDP. Changes to catchment hydrology (in terms of average, median, base and peak flows) is particularly important where there are</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>sensitive downstream wetlands, such as Taupo Swamp. When they considered the provisions of the PDP, hydrological and ecological experts wouldn't have been thinking about likely hydrological and ecological impacts caused by development with more than 50% hard surfacing (nor what resource management tools may be required to manage those effects) because the concept of this type of intensive development was not known to them. The Panel hearing submissions on the PDP has also been in this position. The Panel's questioning of submitters and council experts (in relation to such matters as natural hazards, coastal environment, catchment hydrology, ecosystems and biodiversity, historic heritage ,and cultural sites) is likely to have been significantly different if the PDP had (from the outset) included what is now being proposed with Variation 1. Council officers are apparently suggesting this is inconsequential.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.268	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS64.3	Brian Warburton	Amend	Seeks that the provisions of Variation 1 require amendment to the extent that no buildings or structures (regardless of height or density) shall be permitted on:	Council Officers' Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation 1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. Council officers' comment about my

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the significant natural area provisions of the PDP,</li> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the provisions of the NES-FW relating to natural wetlands,</li> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the natural hazard and risk provisions of the PDP,</li> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the historical and cultural values provisions of the PDP, and</li> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the coastal high natural character area provisions of the PDP</li> </ul> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments where relevant]</p>	<p>feedback indicates they consider the use of the Qualifying Matters provisions of the Amendment Act is not necessary because the provisions of the PDP already address such matters as natural hazards, coastal environment, ecosystems and biodiversity, historic heritage and cultural sites. In addition, council officers consider that the scope of the overlay provisions should not be extended to land “whether or not it comprises an entire parcel” as I have requested.</p> <p>My Counter Argument. I acknowledge that the PDP includes provisions relative to those resource management issues noted by the council officer. But inclusion and adequacy are two different things. The points, which council officers have overlooked, are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PDP is still a proposed district plan, decisions on submissions have not yet been made, and submitters on the PDP have the option of appealing unfavourable decisions to the Environment Court.</li> <li>• All experts who have so far contributed to the PDP process (for submitters and for the Council) were, when they prepared their technical assessments and evaluation, looking at the environment in the context of the</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>PDP as it was notified. They weren't looking at the environment in the context of the PDP but as modified by Variation 1. Indeed, it was impossible for them to have done so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Panel hearing submissions on the PDP has also been in this position. The Panel's questioning of submitters and council experts (in relation to such matters as natural hazards, coastal environment, ecosystems and biodiversity, historic heritage and cultural sites) is likely to have been significantly different if the PDP had (from the outset) included what is now being proposed with Variation 1.</li><li>• Because the PDP (that part of it already heard) is still only 'proposed' submitters do not know what its substance will eventually entail.</li><li>• Because submitters don't know what the substance of the PDP will be they don't know how the PDP will integrate with the Variation 1 provisions.</li><li>• Because submitters don't know how the PDP and the Variation 1 will integrate it is impossible for submitters to make submissions with any confidence about plan</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>provisions necessary to achieve the proposed of the Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only way submitters can have confidence that the purpose of the Act will be achieved [once the Variation 1 provisions (yet to be determined) are integrated within the PDP provisions (also yet to be determined)] is for the Variation 1 provisions to include Qualifying Matters and for those to relate to the resource management issues referred to this submission</li> </ul> <p>It is not possible for robust technical assessments to reconsider the provisions of PDP in the light of what is now proposed with Variation 1. This is not possible because hearings on the substantive provisions of the PDP have already concluded. With the absence of such technical assessments a significant degree of precaution is required. In other words, with Variation 1 (and compared to the 'unvaried' PDP) participants in the process can't have the same degree of confidence that the overlay boundaries are suitably defined. This being the case, and in the absence of site-by-site detailed analysis, I consider an all or nothing approach should be applied to policy overlays. In these circumstances (eg; where there is no or insufficient evidence) it is wise to apply the 'precautionary principle'. In other words, if</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>part of a site is subject to an overlay (regardless of extent), then the overlay provisions should apply to all the site unless proven otherwise.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.269	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.28	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow amendment of Variation 1 as per the suggestion in the first two bullet points of the summary of part3 of OS64.	<p>Support part 3 of OS64 wherein the first two bullet points say Variation 1 requires amendment to the extent that no buildings or structures (regardless of height or density) shall be permitted on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the significant natural area provisions of the PDP,</li> <li>• land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is subject to the provisions of the NES-FW relating to natural wetlands</li> </ul> <p>The suggestions in 64.3 would better ensure “adequacy” in terms of improving the protection of water quality.</p>
OS64.4	Brian Warburton	Amend	The standards of Variation 1 should be amended to include development controls applicable to residential land that is adjacent to land zoned as Open Space	Those development controls are needed because residential development on adjacent land can adversely affect the values attached to land in the Open Space

		<p>and/or areas identified as an ONF/ONL, and/or areas identified as SAL.</p> <p>A 3m + 45o recession plane should apply on such common boundaries.</p> <p>The provisions of Variation 1 require amendment to the extent that buildings or structures higher than 8 metres, higher than a 3m + 45O height recession plane, and occupying more than 40 percent of a site area (either alone or in combination with other buildings) shall not be permitted on:</p> <p>a. land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) that is adjacent to (namely shares a common boundary with) land zoned as Open Space and/or areas identified as an ONF/ONL, or areas identified as SAL.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments where relevant]</p>	<p>zone and/or land identified as ONF, ONL and SALs.</p> <p>Council Officers' Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation 1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. The council officers say that: "there is no reason to consider that the qualifying matter is incompatible with the level of development permitted by the MDRS". The council officer goes on to suggest that, rather disingenuously I feel, I've not defined exactly what values I'm talking about.</p> <p>My Counter Argument. The converse to council officers' 'position' also applies. In other words, "there is no reason to consider that the level of development permitted by the MDRS, and by the MRZ-RIP, provides the protection and avoidance to which s771 'qualifying matters' refers."</p> <p>For example, what evidence has been provided confirming that buildings 22 metres high [refer HRZ-S2(1)(a)], as per Variation 1, will not have any greater effects on the landscape, open space and/or recreational values of adjacent land, than buildings only 8 metres high [refer GRZ-S(1)] as per the notified PDP. There is nothing to suggest that the provisions of the PDP as modified by Variation 1, will allow for the protection and avoidance</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>required in terms of the matters listed in s.77I (a) to (h).</p> <p>That confidence could only be achieved if all the relevant matters referred to, and considered with respect to, the PDP were revisited. That work has not been undertaken essentially because council officers have been reluctant to embrace the concept of 'Qualifying Matters' under the Amendment Act.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.270	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS64.5	Brian Warburton	Amend	<p>Seeks that the provisions of Variation 1 require amendment to the extent that no buildings or structures regardless of height or density shall be permitted on:</p> <p>a. land (whether or not it comprises an entire parcel) within a 'Three -Waters' catchment that does not have installed, operating and functional infrastructure, the capacity of which is sufficient to cater for the additional input (in the case of SW and WW) or demand (in the case of W), from additional development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments where relevant]</p>	<p>Council Officers' Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation 1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. Council officers consider that these matters are managed by the THWT - Three Waters chapter in the PDP.</p> <p>My Counter Argument. I acknowledge that the PDP includes provisions relative to resource management issues associated with Three-Waters servicing as the council officer has noted. But inclusion and adequacy are two different things.</p>



				<p>The points, which council officers have overlooked, are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PDP is still a proposed district plan, decisions on submissions have not yet been made, and submitters on the PDP have the option of appealing unfavourable decisions to the Environment Court.</li> <li>• All experts who have so far contributed to the PDP process (for submitters and for the Council) were, when they prepared their technical assessments and evaluation, looking at the environment in the context of the PDP as it was notified. They weren't looking at the environment in the context of the PDP but as modified by a Variation 1. Indeed, it was impossible for them to have done so.</li> <li>• The Panel hearing submissions on the PDP has also been in this position. The Panel's questioning of submitters and council experts (in relation to such matters as natural hazards, coastal environment, ecosystems and biodiversity, historic heritage and cultural sites) is likely to have been significantly different if the PDP had (from the outset) included what is now being proposed with Variation 1.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the PDP (that part of it already heard) is still only 'proposed' participants do not know what its substance will eventually entail. • Because submitters don't know what the substance of the PDP will be they don't know how the PDP will integrate with the Variation 1 provisions.</li> <li>• Because submitters don't know how the PDP and the Variation 1 will integrate it is impossible for submitters to make submissions with any confidence about plan provisions necessary to achieve the proposed of the Act.</li> <li>• The only way submitters can have confidence that the purpose of the Act will be achieved [once the Variation 1 provisions (yet to be determined) are integrated within the PDP provisions (also yet to be determined)] is for the Variation 1 provisions to include Qualifying Matters and for those to relate to the resource management issues referred to this submission</li> </ul> <p>It is not possible for robust technical assessments to reconsider the provisions of PDP in the light of what is now proposed with Variation 1. That is not now possible because hearings on the key chapters of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>PDP have concluded. With the absence of such technical assessments a significant degree of precaution is required. In other words, with Variation 1 participants can't have the same degree of confidence that the provisions relating to Three-Waters servicing are suitable, and/or adequate to address the resource management issues.</p> <p>In this regard, I note the following: - The Rukutane Point overflow occurs when the network flow from Titahi Bay to the Rukutane Point pumpstation exceeds the pump's capacity (see attached email from WWL). - The Rukutane Point pumpstation has a capacity of 135 L/s. - Any such overflow results in untreated wastewater discharging directly to the marine environment via the main wastewater outfall. - At least twenty such overflows have occurred in the preceding two years. - WWL and PCC are currently seeking a new consent for the operation of the WWTP, and for related discharges to air and to water.</p> <p>- The scope of the consent sought with the WWTP application does not encompass any overflows at the Rukutane Point pumpstation.</p> <p>- PCC has an existing consent (a discharge permit) from Greater Wellington</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>(WGN180027 [34920]). This is commonly known as the “global stormwater consent”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The scope of the discharge approved under the terms of the existing consent (WGN180027 [34920]) is limited to “..... the discharge of stormwater, and stormwater occasionally contaminated with wastewater ...”.</li> <li>- The overflow discharge at the Rukutane Point pumpstation is not stormwater, and nor is the discharge to the stormwater network, and therefore is not authorised by the existing discharge permit (WGN180027 [34920]).</li> <li>- There is no current coastal permit allowing WWL and PCC to discharge wastewater ‘overflows’ at Rukutane Point directly into the coastal marine area. - In summary, the wastewater network, or at least the Titahi Bay ‘sub-catchment’ part of it, is currently being operated by WWL and PCC in breach of section 12 of the RMA, as there is no current coastal permit [refer section 87(c) of the RMA] allowing the discharge of wastewater to the coastal marine area as a result of ‘overflows’ at the Rukutane Point pumpstation.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>- The so-called 'upgrades' to the WWTP, and to the network will not avoid this direct discharge of untreated WW to the CMA.</p> <p>- The proposed 'storage/retention' tanks at Paremata, Plimmerton, and the CBD will do nothing to stem the flow of wastewater from Titahi Bay to the Rukutane Point PS and therefore will not prevent untreated discharge.</p> <p>- And that flow is guaranteed to increase with PCC's proposed housing intensification in Titahi Bay. It's fair to say that intensification has already increased the frequency of WW overflows of untreated wastewater from the Rukutane Pt pump station directly into the CMA.</p> <p>Every bullet point above is a matter of fact. The Council's functions under the RMA include: "the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district." It appears council officers are suggesting that the function of council, in respect of managing the effects from residential development (including effects on the limited capacity of wastewater infrastructure) can be achieved by</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>assessment of individual developments on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>This is the approach historically used. But this has not avoided the current situation whereby development In Titahi Bay has reached a point where infrastructure is unable to cater for demand and the Council is in breach of the RMA provisions relating to discharges of untreated sewage to the coastal environment.</p> <p>For this reason, I do not believe the council officers' approach (which is that these matters are managed by the THWT - Three Waters chapter in the PDP) to be realistic. If it was achievable, then why hasn't it already happened. Why is PCC/WWL currently in breach of the section 12 of the RMA. Afterall the operative District Plan also has provisions in it about developments needing to be adequately serviced.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.271	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS64.6	Brian Warburton	Amend	Seeks that the provisions of Variation 1 require specific amendment to address matters relating to the 'coastal margin' provisions of the PDP, and to ensure that	The proposed definition of 'coastal margin' in the PDP is: "all landward property which is within 20m of the line of MHWS". This definition is relevant in terms of the NATC provisions of the PDP. Those NATC provisions of the PDP are unworkable

		<p>Variation 1 meets the Council’s obligations under section 6(a) of the RMA.</p> <p>The provisions of Variation 1 require amendment to:</p> <p>a. prevent buildings or structures regardless of height or density on any land within a coastal margin:</p> <p>b. amend the definition of ‘coastal margin’ to include this (or similar) statement:</p> <p>i. for the purposes of determining the extent of the coastal margin the line of MHWS shall, except where provided for in (ii), be the landward extent of the LINZ’s NZ Coastlines GIS Polygon (Topo, 1:50k) <a href="https://data.linz.govt.nz/layer/50258-nzcoastlines-topo-150k/">https://data.linz.govt.nz/layer/50258-nzcoastlines-topo-150k/</a></p> <p>ii. (i) above shall not apply for any particular project or activity where the line of MWHS (and the corresponding landward limit of the coastal margin) has been determined by a suitably qualified person as being applicable for that project and activity and for the specific location where the activity or project will be undertaken, and where that determination has been certified by the Council.</p>	<p>without the line of MHWS being defined. Mapping by LINZ suggests significant parts of the Porirua District are within the coastal margin as well as being within the residential zone. Developments within the coastal margin of the type that the Amendment Act implies should be potentially facilitated (all other things being equal) should be excluded from the enabling provisions.</p> <p>Council Officers’ Response to My Comment on Draft of Variation 1. Refer Appendix G of Section 32 Evaluation Report - Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3. Council officers’ response to my comment on the draft has been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This matter is managed by the NATC - Natural Character chapter in the PDP.</li> <li>• Identifying the coastal margin has been addressed in HS1 and HS2 [sic] hearings.</li> <li>• The LINZ layer, referred to by the submitter, “in some cases is not close to the MHWS”.</li> </ul> <p>My Counter Argument.</p> <p><u>Is it the PDP, or is it the PDP as amended by Variation 1</u></p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>[Refer to original submission for full decision requested, including attachments where relevant]</p>	<p>I acknowledge that the PDP includes provisions relative to resource management issues associated with the natural character of the coastal margin, as noted by the council officer. But inclusion and adequacy are two different things.</p> <p>The points, which council officers have overlooked, are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PDP is still a proposed district plan, decisions on submissions have not yet been made, and submitters on the PDP have the option of appealing unfavourable decisions to the Environment Court.</li> <li>• All experts who have so far contributed to the PDP process (for submitters and for the Council) were, when they prepared their technical assessments and evaluation, looking at the environment in the context of the PDP as it was notified. They weren't looking at the environment in the context of the PDP but as modified by a Variation 1. Indeed, it was impossible for them to have done so.</li> <li>• The Panel hearing submissions on the PDP has also been in this position. The Panel's questioning of submitters and council experts (in relation to such matters as natural</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---



				<p>hazards, coastal environment, ecosystems and biodiversity, historic heritage and cultural sites) is likely to have been significantly different if the PDP had (from the outset) included what is now being proposed with Variation 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the PDP (that part of it already heard) is still only 'proposed' participants do not know what its substance will eventually entail.</li> <li>• Because submitters don't know what the substance of the PDP will be they don't know how the PDP will integrate with the Variation 1 provisions.</li> <li>• Because submitters don't know how the PDP and the Variation 1 will integrate it is impossible for submitters to make submissions with any confidence about plan provisions necessary to achieve the proposed of the Act.</li> <li>• The only way submitters can have confidence that the purpose of the Act will be achieved [once the Variation 1 provisions (yet to be determined) are integrated within the PDP provisions (also yet to be determined)] is for the Variation 1 provisions to include Qualifying Matters and for those to relate to</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the resource management issues referred to this submission.</p> <p>Council staff are, in essence, stating that the coastal natural character issues associated with Variation 1 don't need to be considered because provisions relating to that issue have already been incorporated into the PDP. The implication of this approach is that officers think that coastal natural character effects of a 22m high residential building are the same as an 8m high building, or in more simplistic terms, Variation 1 is of no consequence in terms of coastal character chapter of the PDP. I dispute that.</p> <p>It is quite possible that experts dealing with the coastal natural character provisions (if they had considered the potential implications of 22m high buildings) may well have been recommended a coastal margin wider than 20 metres to allow for better management of adverse effects on coastal character from buildings of that dimension and scale. But, they wouldn't have been thinking about the benefits of a wider coastal margin, because the concept of 22m high buildings in the residential area was not known to them. The Panel hearing submissions on the PDP has also been in this position. The Panel's questioning of submitters and council experts (in relation to such matters as coastal natural</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>character) is likely to have been significantly different if the PDP had (from the outset) included what is now being proposed with Variation 1.</p> <p>Identifying the coastal margin – PDP Hearings. The council officer is incorrect in saying that the issue has been addressed in the PDP hearings. This matter is still ‘live’ and it has not been “addressed” in HS1 and HS2 hearings which is what the council officer suggests. It would be more correct to say that it has “been referred to in previous PDP hearings”. All provisions of the PDP are still subject to the Panel’s decisions and from thereon also potentially subject to appeal, and therefore haven’t been “addressed”.</p> <p>Identifying the coastal margin – accuracy The council officer has said: “The LINZ layer, referred to by the submitter, in some cases is not close to the MHWS.” The questions that flow from this statement are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the council officer to make this statement he must know the alignment of the MHWS. How does he know this?</li> <li>• If the council officer/the council knows the alignment of the MHWS, why hasn’t this been incorporated into the PDP (perhaps by a</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>variation) with an additional GIS spatial layer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why has the council officer repeated the fallacy that the LINZ 'NZ Coastlines' polygon (which is what I have proposed) is less accurate than the LINZ 'NZ Parcels' polygon which is the option preferred by this council officer even though the LINZ 'NZ Parcels' polygon is based on cadastral boundaries and is completely ineffectual and inaccurate in defining the boundaries of the coastal margin. In this regard I refer to several screenshots included in Attachment A. These show how the LINZ 'NZ Coastlines' polygon is much more accurate in depicting the likely line of MHWS than the LINZ 'NZ Parcels' polygon.</li><li>• Why has the council not embraced the suggestion made by Ms Smith (a submitter on the PDP) about a suitable approach to determining the landward limit of the CMA. This was included in her memorandum to the PDP Hearing Panel. A copy of that memorandum is attached to this submission as Attachment 2. The approach outlined therein is workable and much more useful for</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>users of the district plan than the council officers' alternative</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments where relevant]</p>
FS17.272	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS72.1	KiwiRail	Amend	Seeks that these standards [MRZ-S5, HRZ-S4, LCZ-S3, MUZ-S3] be amended to be increased to from 1.5m to 5m.	<p>Supports the identification of rail as a qualifying matter and the retention of the [MRZ-S5, HRZ-S4, LCZ-S3, MUZ-S3] standards.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.298	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.370	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as the proposed 1.5m set back provides 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.
OS72.3	KiwiRail	Not Stated	Seeks a 5m setback for buildings on sites adjoining the rail corridor. Seeks the setback to be increased to 5m and this be applied to all zones adjoining the rail corridor within the scope of Variation 1.	Strongly supports the identification of the rail corridor setback as a qualifying matter in all zones affected by Variation 1 adjoining the rail corridor. The 1.5m setback proposed by Council is insufficient. The need for a greater setback is particularly required given the increased building height, reduced height to boundary controls and greater densities of people living adjacent to the rail corridor enabled under the MDRS. The intensification of land

				<p>adjacent to the rail corridor increases the risk of potential interference with the rail corridor by building maintenance and other activities being undertaken on sites adjoining the rail corridor. This risk needs to be managed.</p> <p>The setback as drafted in the Proposed Plan and Variation 1 also does not apply to eaves up to a maximum of 600mm and external gutters or downpipes (including their brackets) up to an additional width of 150mm. This effectively makes the 1.5m setback as proposed 750mm in reality. This provides a very limited area between the rail corridor and structures within which people can use to maintain their buildings without encroaching at all into the rail corridor. KiwiRail does not consider this distance meets the Council's stated goals of protecting the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor which the Council is relying on to "deliver transformational urban development and more affordable housing choices". If the Council is committed to leveraging the existing rail corridor infrastructure to deliver more affordable housing choices then it needs to ensure suitable setbacks to ensure that the rail infrastructure can operate efficiently and safely.</p>
FS17.300	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

FS76.371	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, as the proposed 1.5m set back provides 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.
OS72.4	KiwiRail	Amend	Retention of identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter.	The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will: (a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA; (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district; (d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure; (e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.
FS17.301	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS72.10	KiwiRail	Amend	Amendment of setback standards in MRZ-S5, HRZ-S4, LCZ-S3 and MUZ-S3 from 1.5m to 5m.	The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended

				<p>below) will:</p> <p>(a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;</p> <p>(b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;</p> <p>(c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district;</p> <p>(d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure;</p> <p>(e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.</p>
FS17.307	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS72.11	KiwiRail	Amend	Introduction of a 5m setback standard for in any other zones [zones other than MRZ, HRZ, LCZ or MUZ] adjoining the rail corridor affected by Variation 1.	<p>The identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and setbacks from the rail corridor (as proposed to be amended below) will:</p> <p>(a) promote sustainable management of resources, achieve the purpose of the RMA, and are not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;</p> <p>(b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;</p>



				<p>(c) enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community in the Porirua district;</p> <p>(d) provide and promote the greatest health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure;</p> <p>(e) be, in terms of section 32 of the RMA, the most appropriate way to give effect to the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the Proposed Plan.</p>
FS17.308	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.1	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Seeks that its facilities at Porirua are recognised as a "qualifying matter" in the Proposed Variation.	<p>This is required to address safety risks associated with new construction more than 10m tall near RNZ's transmitters.</p> <p>The submitter is a Crown entity established under the Radio New Zealand Act 1995. The submitter owns and operates radio transmission facilities at Whitireia Park, Porirua (RNZ's Facilities / the Porirua Site). Radiocommunication activities at RNZ's Facilities are carried out by The submitter and other broadcasters using equipment that is owned, maintained and operated by each broadcaster. The submitter maintains the infrastructure surrounding the equipment. It is important that the continued operation, maintenance and</p>

				<p>improvement of The submitter's national transmission network can occur unimpeded. The submitter facilities are an integral and important part of The submitter's national communication network, and it is appropriate that the Proposed Variation recognises this and provides for The submitter's activities. The submitter's Facilities perform an important role in, among other things, providing news and information to the public and performing a civil defence role (radio is a key communication tool in the event of natural disasters and RNZ is designated as a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002). As a lifeline utility, it is critically important that RNZ is not unduly restricted from carrying out activities that are fundamental to the ongoing operation of its transmission activities.</p>
FS17.310	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.5	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Seeks recognition of its infrastructure as a "qualifying matter" in the Proposed Variation, justifying limits on MDRS height limits for development within a 1,057m radius.	In order to be considered a 'qualifying matter' the submitter's radiocommunication facilities at Porirua must be assessed according to s77J, including a site specific analysis under s77L of the Enabling Housing Act. Submitter sets out the rationale for why these assessment matters are met.

				[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.314	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.6	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Unrestricted development to MDRS standards should be avoided within these areas as a matter of health and safety, as well as a matter of secure and efficient functioning of radiocommunications.	Building height limits contained in the MDRS are inappropriate within 528 metres of submitter's facilities, and may be inappropriate within 1,057 metres (subject to construction materials). We have outlined the specific characteristics of submitter's facilities which make this inappropriate.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.315	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
OS73.7	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Height limits should be the same as existing rules in the operative (and proposed) Porirua District Plan. Within 528 metres of the Porirua Site, there should be no structures above 10 metres in height in order to avoid EMR coupling. Buildings within this area be subject to a 10 metre height limit. Within 1,057 metres of the Porirua Site, the design of any structure above 10 metres in height must include a site-specific and construction materials-specific EMR assessment to ensure the structure does not compromise the safety of workers or occupants. Buildings within this area be restricted to 10 metres in	MDRS standards allow buildings up to 11 metres in height. This is inappropriate near the submitter's facilities. Notes that height limits contained within the operative (and proposed) Porirua District Plan are limited to 10m.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]

			height, unless [the submitter] provides written approval that the site and construction materials are appropriate. It is important that the submitter work with developers to ensure that workers and/or occupants are not exposed to unsafe EMR levels.	
FS17.316	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.377	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter and resulting changes sought to the MDRS and proposed new matter of discretion. Kāinga Ora does not consider the submitter has provided adequate reasoning to demonstrate why a 1m reduction from 11m to 10m within 528m of the Porirua Site is necessary to manage the stated effect(s).
OS73.8	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	<p>Seeks that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 528 metres of the Porirua Site, there should be no structures above 10 metres in height; and</li> <li>• Within 1,057 metres of the Porirua Site, the design of any structure above 10 metres in height must include a site-specific and construction materials-specific EMR assessment.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed changes apply to all sites within these radii. No other modifications to density standards are sought, as development below 10m is not associated with increased risk. No limits on changed</p>	<p>MDRS standards allow buildings up to 11 metres in height, which is inappropriate near submitter's Facilities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]</p>

			density standards are sought within this height limit.	
FS17.317	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.378	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter and resulting changes sought to the MDRS and proposed new matter of discretion. Kāinga Ora does not consider the submitter has provided adequate reasoning to demonstrate why a 1m reduction from 11m to 10m within 528m of the Porirua Site is necessary to manage the stated effect(s).
OS73.9	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	Seeks recognition of its radiocommunication activities at Porirua as a qualifying matter in the Proposed Variation, justifying height limits of 10m as opposed to the 11m permitted under MDRS. Also suggests a stronger policy framework to recognise the importance of qualifying matters and why they justify restrictions on MDRS.	At present, there is no clearly prescribed list of qualifying matters, nor the reasons for their inclusion in the Proposed Variation.  [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]
FS17.318	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS76.379	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed qualifying matter.
OS73.16	Radio New Zealand Limited	Not Stated	The submitter's facilities at Porirua should be included as a "qualifying matter" in the Proposed Variation.	For the reasons outlined in [the submission].  [Refer to original submission for full reason]
FS17.325	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.

OS74.76	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Oppose	<p>Identify the coastal hazard overlays for flooding, erosion and future flooding and erosion due to sea level rise as a coastal hazard zone. Recognise this zone as a qualifying matter and prevent medium and high density residential overlays from applying in this zone. Within this zone any development or intensification should be subject to the existing provisions/rule framework in the proposed district plan.</p>	<p>Allowing for medium and high density residential zoning in the high and medium coastal hazard zones is contrary to the following provisions of the district plan: NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P3.</p> <p>The policy and rule framework allows for development in high and moderate hazard areas provided it meets certain conditions and is controlled as a discretionary or noncomplying activity. Thus, whilst there are restrictions, there is a consenting pathway through these constraints and potentially medium and high density housing could be built in coastal areas identified as having a risk from natural hazards including: Pukerua Bay Beach; Plimmerton coastline, Mana and Pauatahanui Inlet.</p> <p>These areas are all subject to increasing risks from coastal flooding and erosion as a result of sea level rise. While a certain amount of hazard mitigation can be undertaken to deal with flooding, erosion or seismic hazards, nothing can be done about sea level rise. We are locked into at least one metre of sea level rise and probably more over the next 100 years. This will have severe consequences for our coastal areas in terms of shoreline readjustment and flooding, both from the sea and due to impacts on groundwater and stormwater. Insurance will not cover impacts from sea</p>
---------	-------------------------------------	--------	--	---

				<p>level rise because it is foreseeable and predictable. There should simply be no further intensification in these areas beyond what is already provided for in the proposed district plan for these areas. They should not be identified as medium or high density residential zones. Doing so is contrary to the proposed district plan, the operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>
FS17.401	Leigh Subritzky	Support	Submitter requests the submission point be allowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances my points made and am 100% support of their comments and rationale.
FS32.57	Harbour Trust & Guardians of Pāuatahanui Inlet	Support	Allow all part 76 of OS74	<p>Coastal hazard overlays should be required for flooding, erosion and future flooding and erosion due to sea level rise in coastal hazard zone. Neither medium nor high density residential zoning should be allowed in the high and medium coastal hazard zones.</p> <p>Allowing further development in coastal hazard zones merely compounds known dangers of climate change and creates a further burden on the local authority for implementing policies such as “managed retreat”</p>
FS76.389	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing hazards. However, the natural hazard risk-based provisions can appropriately manage development in areas prone to hazard, rather than altering the underlying zone.

OS81.11	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Not Stated	Amend the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone provisions to include the relevant noise provisions as a qualifying matter (or other method) and the amendments sought as part of Waka Kotahi Planning Evidence of Catherine Heppelthwaite (dated the 21 January 2022) on the Proposed Porirua District Plan.	<p>Noise and vibration effects can interrupt amenity and enjoyment, as well as ability to sleep which can have significant impacts on people's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The PDP includes provisions that require appropriate noise and vibration mitigation for noise sensitive activities adjacent to the transport network. There will be a transitional period before the proposed district-wide noise provisions are made operative. The reverse sensitivity provisions should also be included as a qualifying matter in order to provide for a healthy indoor and outdoor noise environment for residents of new buildings in the Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones. This will ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of these transport networks and the health and wellbeing of those residing or otherwise occupying nearby sites is protected.</p>
FS17.1045	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
FS72.46	KiwiRail	Support	Adopt amendment sought in submission.	KiwiRail agrees with the reasons provided in Waka Kotahi's submission on this point in their entirety. In its primary submission, KiwiRail sought retention of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail agrees that the noise provisions should appropriately included as a qualifying matter for the



				transport network, including the rail network.
FS76.396	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora does not support the relief sought and does not consider that these issues are qualifying matters.
OS83.12	Isabella G F Cawthorn	Amend	Shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed, with a policy for providing popup nearby public realm for development-shaded homes.	<p>Good quality public realm within one minute's universally accessible walk from a development-shaded home should be considered an adequate substitute for sun on one's individual property. One minute's walking or wheelchairs time (the "Ugg-boots-and-cuppa" radius) is the actual time, including waiting to cross any road.</p> <p>As part of our cities' transition, people's homes will gradually improve and there will be less need for people to use sun to air out a damp and mouldy home.</p> <p>But in that transitional period if a home becomes shaded people will need access to universally-accessible, nearby, sunlit public realm for their wellbeing. So a parklets program and a pop up parks program should be instituted in the interim so they're stood up promptly.</p>
FS17.1097	Leigh Subritzky	Oppose	Submitter requests the submission point be disallowed.	The submitter shares, echo's and enhances none of my points and I 100% do not support their comments and rationale.
OS112.7	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks to have future residential intensification surrounding the site reflect the established operation of the Porirua Substation facility and thus mitigate the potential adverse effects of reverse	The Porirua Zone Substation is located in a residential setting on 3 Mungavin Avenue, Ranui in Porirua and is supplied by two 33kV feeders. The Site contains two outdoor 33/11 kV, 20 MVA transformers,

			<p>sensitivity.</p> <p>Seeks Council treat the Porirua Substation Facility as a 'Qualifying Matter' under the NPS-UD, and protect the critical electricity supply facility [from] the adverse effects of actual or potential reverse sensitivity.</p> <p>Seeks that any intensification of 3 and 3D Mungavin Avenue, 1 A&amp;B, 3 Champion Street, 9-13 Mephram Place is provided for as restricted discretionary.</p>	<p>each supplying an 11kV, 1,200 A bus section. The residential properties of 3 and 3D Mungavin Avenue, 1 A&amp;B, 3 Champion Street, 9-13 Mephram Place all about the substation property, all of which are determined to be contained in a High Density Residential Zone under Variation 1 thereby enabling a high intensity and bulk of buildings such as apartments and townhouses as close as 1.0m from the site boundary. The substation site is identified in the Operative Porirua District Plan ('ODP') as being within the Suburban Zone and is not designated for electricity distribution purposes. The site is identified in the PDP as being located within the Medium Density Residential Zone and is not designated for electricity distribution purposes. Under Variation 1 the site is to be contain[ed] in and surrounded by High Density Residential Zone and therefore can be expected to see significant residential intensification surrounding the property.</p> <p>As the City grows, so too will the electricity supply load growth and hence demand on the Porirua Substation. Such growth will ultimately require upgrades to the substation (new transformer(s) and possibly feeder lines). Council's ability to regulate intensification in the High Density Residential Zone through qualifying matters could be applied to such areas immediately abutting existing</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>sites and facilities. Section 771 of the legislation allows Council to make development within pockets of the high density areas less enabling if it is considered inappropriate for the area to accommodate it. Seeks 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 Porirua Substation.</p> <p>Does not wish to prohibit intensified development being undertaken adjacent to the Porirua Substation as this is not the primary concern. Rather, that any intensification of the above mentioned properties is provided for as restricted discretionary development so as to adequately integrate appropriate feedback 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).</p>
FS76.400	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes 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.
OS112.8	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited (WELL)	Not Stated	Seeks that 'Qualifying Matters' be applied in relation to the Porirua Substation and Waitangirua Substation to the extent that neighbouring (abutting) High and Medium Density properties cannot develop multi-	[Refer to original submission for full reason]

			unit housing only 1.0m setback [from] the boundary, as a permitted activity;	
FS76.401	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Disallow	Kāinga Ora opposes 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.