

**Plan Change 2  
Council Officers' Planning Evidence**

**Appendix C**

**Recommendations on decisions requested in submissions  
Organised by primary submission number**

## List of Submitters

Primary Sub #	Further Sub #	Submitter name		Contact person (if different)		Address for service
		Last name, or Organisation/Company/Trust name	First name	Last name (contact person)	First name (contact person)	
S001		Dyer	Mary	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:mary.dyer3@outlook.com">mary.dyer3@outlook.com</a>
S002	S002.FS.1	Fleming	Michael	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:engineer.geotechnical@gmail.com">engineer.geotechnical@gmail.com</a>
S003		Gazula	Sri	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:sri.gazula@gmail.com">sri.gazula@gmail.com</a>
S004		Averi	Peter	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:paveri7@gmail.com">paveri7@gmail.com</a>
S005		Kilbride	James	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jamesekilbride@gmail.com">jamesekilbride@gmail.com</a>
S006		Webster	Stuart Gordon & Coral Lillian	Webster	Stuart	<a href="mailto:swebsternz@outlook.com">swebsternz@outlook.com</a>
S007		Watson	Hillary & Stephen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:hilary@sheep-r-us.co.nz">hilary@sheep-r-us.co.nz</a>
S008		McIntyre	Mark	Landlink	N/A	<a href="mailto:jenny@landlink.co.nz">jenny@landlink.co.nz</a>
S009		Callister	Dr Paul	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:paul.callister@outlook.com">paul.callister@outlook.com</a>
S010		Xu & Xiong	Xiang & Shimin	Xu	Xiang	<a href="mailto:xiang.xu@windowslive.com">xiang.xu@windowslive.com</a>
S011		Kress	Sahra	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:sahra@nikaumidwives.com">sahra@nikaumidwives.com</a>
S012		Bulletin Trust	N/A	Sutorius	Stephen	<a href="mailto:stephens@thamespacific.com">stephens@thamespacific.com</a>
S013		Pearson	Tania	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:ajp2hammr@yahoo.co.nz">ajp2hammr@yahoo.co.nz</a>
S014		Summerset Group Holdings Limited	N/A	Muller	Stephanie	<a href="mailto:Stephanie.Muller@summerset.co.nz">Stephanie.Muller@summerset.co.nz</a>
S015		Manhire	William	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:bill.manhire@vuw.ac.nz">bill.manhire@vuw.ac.nz</a>
S016		Mann	Amos	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:Qmos@yahoo.com">Qmos@yahoo.com</a>
S017		Shroff	Gordon	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:gordon.shroff@icloud.com">gordon.shroff@icloud.com</a>
S018		Maclean Street Apartments	N/A	Gallagher	Sue	<a href="mailto:Bodycorp85858@gmail.com">Bodycorp85858@gmail.com</a>
S019		Moxon	Christopher	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:chris.moxon@moxonpartners.com">chris.moxon@moxonpartners.com</a>
S020		Treadwell	Mical	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:mical@treadwells.co.nz">mical@treadwells.co.nz</a>
S021		Cunningham	Stephen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:raja@xtra.co.nz">raja@xtra.co.nz</a>
S022		Amad	Linda	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:laamad@outlook.com">laamad@outlook.com</a>
S023	S023.FS.1	Mansell	RP, AJ, MR	Hansen	Chris	<a href="mailto:chris@rmaexpert.co.nz">chris@rmaexpert.co.nz</a>
S024		W North Limited	-	Bland	Tom	<a href="mailto:tom@landmatters.nz">tom@landmatters.nz</a>
S025		Grant	John	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:alvington@hotmail.com">alvington@hotmail.com</a>
S026		The Loyalty Initiative	-	Carter	Anna	<a href="mailto:anna@landmatters.nz">anna@landmatters.nz</a>
S027		Ryan	Rachel	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:ryanshome@xtra.co.nz">ryanshome@xtra.co.nz</a>
S028		Infill Tapui Limited	N/A	Addington	Ben	<a href="mailto:ben.addington@infill.nz">ben.addington@infill.nz</a>
S029		Cole	Pauline	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:lynncole86@gmail.com">lynncole86@gmail.com</a>
S030		Grattan Investments Ltd	N/A	Grattan	Wayne	<a href="mailto:wayne@otakicold.co.nz">wayne@otakicold.co.nz</a>
S031		Otaki Revisited Limited	N/A	Hope-Pearson	Earl	<a href="mailto:earl.hopepearson@twc.co.nz">earl.hopepearson@twc.co.nz</a>
S032		Mallia	James	Bland	Tom	<a href="mailto:tom@landmatters.nz">tom@landmatters.nz</a>
S033		O'Brien	Nicola	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:nikiprincess@xtra.co.nz">nikiprincess@xtra.co.nz</a>
S034		Jones & Paul	Peter & Heather	Jones	Peter	<a href="mailto:peter@ourbeach.nz">peter@ourbeach.nz</a>
S035		Hazlitt	Joanne	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:djhazlitt@xtra.co.nz">djhazlitt@xtra.co.nz</a>
S036		Hazlitt	David	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:djhazlitt@xtra.co.nz">djhazlitt@xtra.co.nz</a>
S037		Crockford	Geoffrey	Crockford	Geoff	<a href="mailto:geoffc@outlook.co.nz">geoffc@outlook.co.nz</a>
S038		Whiteley	Timothy	Whiteley	Tim	<a href="mailto:timwhiteley7@gmail.com">timwhiteley7@gmail.com</a>
S039		Parnell	Ruth	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:ruthparnell@outlook.co.nz">ruthparnell@outlook.co.nz</a>
S040		Poole	Joanna	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:joanna.poole@poolecom.co.nz">joanna.poole@poolecom.co.nz</a>
S041		Murphy	Christine	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:syhprum.chris@gmail.com">syhprum.chris@gmail.com</a>
S042		Opperman	Reinier & Suzette	Opperman	Suzette	<a href="mailto:suzette.opperman@outlook.com">suzette.opperman@outlook.com</a>
S043		Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	N/A	Thornton	Elliott	<a href="mailto:elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz">elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz</a>
S044		Heyne	Axel	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:heyne.axel@gmx.de">heyne.axel@gmx.de</a>
S045		Le Harivel	John	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:xtr181373@xtra.co.nz">xtr181373@xtra.co.nz</a>
S046		Vickers	Amanda	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:amanda.m.vickers@gmail.com">amanda.m.vickers@gmail.com</a>
S047		Humphries	Nicholas	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:6humphries@gmail.com">6humphries@gmail.com</a>
S048		Driver	Hugh	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:hugh.driver.nz@gmail.com">hugh.driver.nz@gmail.com</a>
S049		Rowan	Jennifer	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jenjools@xtra.co.nz">jenjools@xtra.co.nz</a>
S050		Poole	Quentin	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:quentin@academypapparel.co.nz">quentin@academypapparel.co.nz</a>
S051		Franks	Jeffery	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:kapitieff@gmail.com">kapitieff@gmail.com</a>
S052		Catchpole Wynne Ltd C/- Cuttriss	N/A	Thornton	Elliott	<a href="mailto:elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz">elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz</a>
S053	S053.FS.1	Waka Kotahi	N/A	Cottle	Kim	<a href="mailto:EnvironmentalPlanning@nzta.govt.nz">EnvironmentalPlanning@nzta.govt.nz</a>
S054	S054.FS.1	Jonas	Malu	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jonasmalu9@gmail.com">jonasmalu9@gmail.com</a>
S055		McIntyre	Andrew	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:andy@seaside.co.nz">andy@seaside.co.nz</a>

Primary Sub #	Further Sub #	Submitter name		Contact person (if different)		Address for service
		Last name, or Organisation/Company/Trust name	First name	Last name (contact person)	First name (contact person)	
S056		Camp	Rod	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:camp.fam@xtra.co.nz">camp.fam@xtra.co.nz</a>
S057		Scholl	Stephan	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:stephen.scholl@gmail.com">stephen.scholl@gmail.com</a>
S058		Davis	Briony & Lloyd	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:brionydaviesnz@gmail.com">brionydaviesnz@gmail.com</a>
S059		Feast	Deborah	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:deb.fest@gmail.com">deb.fest@gmail.com</a>
S060		Feast	John	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:feast.waikanae@gmail.com">feast.waikanae@gmail.com</a>
S061		Dickson	Stuart & Fiona	Dickson	Stuart	<a href="mailto:stuardickson.nz@gmail.com">stuardickson.nz@gmail.com</a>
S062		Pritchard	Mary	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:admin@sepnz.co.nz">admin@sepnz.co.nz</a>
S063		Pritchard	Stuart	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:stuart@sepnz.co.nz">stuart@sepnz.co.nz</a>
S064		Milne	Philip	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:philip.milne@waterfront.org.nz">philip.milne@waterfront.org.nz</a>
S065		Woon	James	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jameswoon@icloud.com">jameswoon@icloud.com</a>
S066		Bismark	Matthew	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:matthew.bismark@gmail.com">matthew.bismark@gmail.com</a>
S067		Manly Flats Limited	N/A	Milne	Catherine	<a href="mailto:philip.milne@waterfront.org.nz">philip.milne@waterfront.org.nz</a>
S068		Carter	Anna & John	Carter	Anna	<a href="mailto:annacartermail@gmail.com">annacartermail@gmail.com</a>
S069		Fiti	Faimasulu	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:faimasulu@gmail.com">faimasulu@gmail.com</a>
S070		Brewerton	Paul	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:thebrewertonz@gmail.com">thebrewertonz@gmail.com</a>
S071		Juchnowicz (nee Devereux)	Anne	Juchnowicz	Anne	<a href="mailto:annezig@xtra.co.nz">annezig@xtra.co.nz</a>
S072		Wyatt	Warwick	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:warwick@thewyattfamily.net">warwick@thewyattfamily.net</a>
S073		Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	N/A	Savage	Mandy	<a href="mailto:mandys@cancersoc.org.nz">mandys@cancersoc.org.nz</a>
S074	S074.FS.1	Hazelton	Andrew	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:andrew.hazelton@hazelton.co.nz">andrew.hazelton@hazelton.co.nz</a>
S075		Brain	Peter	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:petenz01@yahoo.co.uk">petenz01@yahoo.co.uk</a>
S076		Transpower New Zealand Limited	N/A	Hamilton	Daniel	<a href="mailto:environment.policy@transpower.co.nz">environment.policy@transpower.co.nz</a>
S077		Francis Holdings Ltd.	N/A	Thomas	Paul	<a href="mailto:paul@thomasplanning.co.nz">paul@thomasplanning.co.nz</a>
S078		Lynch	Winifred & Bruce	Lynch	Bruce	<a href="mailto:bruce.lynch@xtra.co.nz">bruce.lynch@xtra.co.nz</a>
S079	S079.FS.1	Halliburton	Barbara	N/A	N/A	11/72 Rimu Road, Raumati
S080		Mealings	Marion	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:marionmealings@gmail.com">marionmealings@gmail.com</a>
S081		Mealings	Michael	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:mikemealings@gmail.com">mikemealings@gmail.com</a>
S082		Paekākāriki Housing Trust	N/A	Stringfellow	Mike	<a href="mailto:paekakarikhousingtrust@gmail.com">paekakarikhousingtrust@gmail.com</a>
S083		Bevin	Helen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:helen-tom.bevin@xtra.co.nz">helen-tom.bevin@xtra.co.nz</a>
S084		Bevin	Thomas	Bevin	Tom	<a href="mailto:helen-tom.bevin@xtra.co.nz">helen-tom.bevin@xtra.co.nz</a>
S085		Friends of Lake Karuwha	N/A	Francis	Liz	<a href="mailto:l.francis.nz@gmail.com">l.francis.nz@gmail.com</a>
S086	S085.FS.1 S085.FS.2	Houston	David	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dhouston66@gmail.com">dhouston66@gmail.com</a>
S087	S087.FS.1	Waikanae East Landowners	N/A	Carter & Todd	Anna & Nicola	<a href="mailto:anna@landmatters.nz">anna@landmatters.nz</a> <a href="mailto:nicola@cuttriss.co.nz">nicola@cuttriss.co.nz</a>
S088		Wakapua Farm Limited	N/A	Agar	Katie	<a href="mailto:katie@fountainpm.co.nz">katie@fountainpm.co.nz</a>
S089		Fire and Emergency New Zealand	N/A	Rohleder	Fleur	<a href="mailto:fleur.rohleder@beca.com">fleur.rohleder@beca.com</a>
S090		Starr	Alex	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:patandalex@xtra.co.nz">patandalex@xtra.co.nz</a>
S091		Murland	Shane & Jocelyn	Thornton	Elliot	<a href="mailto:elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz">elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz</a>
S092		Antcliff	Norman	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:norm.antcliff@live.com">norm.antcliff@live.com</a>
S093		Bellabby Ltd	N/A	Thornton	Elliott	<a href="mailto:elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz">elliott.thornton@cuttriss.co.nz</a>
S094	S094.FS.1	KiwiRail	N/A	Grinlinton-Hancock	Michelle	<a href="mailto:michelle.grinlinton-hancock@kiwirail.co.nz">michelle.grinlinton-hancock@kiwirail.co.nz</a>
S095		Berthold	Thomas & Fiona	Berthold	Thomas	<a href="mailto:thosberthold@gmail.com">thosberthold@gmail.com</a>
S096		Brady	Diane & Steve	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:bradybunchnz@gmail.com">bradybunchnz@gmail.com</a>
S097	S097.FS.1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	N/A	Zollner	Mika	<a href="mailto:Mika.Zollner@gw.govt.nz">Mika.Zollner@gw.govt.nz</a>
S098	S098.FS.1	Wiggs	Glen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:glen@wiggssy.com">glen@wiggssy.com</a>
S099		Terry & Meads	John & Sarah	Terry	John	<a href="mailto:john@terry.net.nz">john@terry.net.nz</a>
S100	S100.FS.1	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	N/A	Gibb	Claire	<a href="mailto:claire@tekonae.co.nz">claire@tekonae.co.nz</a>
S101	S101.FS.1	Toka Tū Ake EQC	N/A	Horrocks	Jo	<a href="mailto:resilience@eqc.govt.nz">resilience@eqc.govt.nz</a>
S102		Hollett	Stephen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:steve.hollett@outlook.com">steve.hollett@outlook.com</a>
S103		Breese	Steve	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:steve@creation.net.nz">steve@creation.net.nz</a>
S104	S104.FS.1	Waikanae Land Company	N/A	Slyfield	Morgan	<a href="mailto:morgan.slyfield@stoutstreet.co.nz">morgan.slyfield@stoutstreet.co.nz</a>
S105		Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc	N/A	Duignan	Pat	<a href="mailto:pat.duignan@outlook.com">pat.duignan@outlook.com</a>
S106		Munro Duignan Trust	N/A	Duignan	Pat	<a href="mailto:pat.duignan@outlook.com">pat.duignan@outlook.com</a>
S107		Land Matters Limited	N/A	Xkenjik	Milcah	<a href="mailto:milcah@landmatters.nz">milcah@landmatters.nz</a>
S108	S108.FS.1	Yager	Graeme	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:g.yager@xtra.co.nz">g.yager@xtra.co.nz</a>

Primary Sub #	Further Sub #	Submitter name		Contact person (if different)		Address for service
		Last name, or Organisation/Company/Trust name	First name	Last name (contact person)	First name (contact person)	
S109		Yager	Elizabeth	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:libbyyager@icloud.com">libbyyager@icloud.com</a>
S110		Mitchell & Smith	Chris & Sue	Mitchell	Sue	<a href="mailto:chris.mitchell@mitchelllaw.co.nz">chris.mitchell@mitchelllaw.co.nz</a>
S111		Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	N/A	Millar	Andrea	<a href="mailto:rmalm@corrections.govt.nz">rmalm@corrections.govt.nz</a>
S112		Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	N/A	Stirling	Sian	<a href="mailto:Sian.Stirling@beca.com">Sian.Stirling@beca.com</a>
S113		Herrington	Garry	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:garry.herrington@gmail.com">garry.herrington@gmail.com</a>
S114	S114.FS.1	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	N/A	Laurenson	Mark	<a href="mailto:markl@4sight.co.nz">markl@4sight.co.nz</a>
S115		Templeton Kapiti Limited	N/A	Familton	M	<a href="mailto:office@brownandcompany.co.nz">office@brownandcompany.co.nz</a>
S116		Petherick	Laurence	Petherick	Laurie	<a href="mailto:rlpetherick@xtra.co.nz">rlpetherick@xtra.co.nz</a>
S117		Carter	Brian	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:briancarternz@gmail.com">briancarternz@gmail.com</a>
S118		Eames	Penelope	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:pseeames@gmail.com">pseeames@gmail.com</a>
S119		Coastal Ratepayers United Inc	N/A	Griffiths	Roger	<a href="mailto:bippergriff@gmail.com">bippergriff@gmail.com</a>
S120		Brown	Melissa	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:mellojbrown@hotmail.com">mellojbrown@hotmail.com</a>
S121		Gunston	Robin	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:robin.gunston@gmail.com">robin.gunston@gmail.com</a>
S122	S122.FS.1	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	N/A	Liggett	Brendon	<a href="mailto:developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz">developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz</a>
S123		Liakhovskaia	Stacey	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:alalykina@gmail.com">alalykina@gmail.com</a>
S124		Patterson	Andrena & Bruce	Patterson	Andrena	<a href="mailto:andrena.patterson.ap@gmail.com">andrena.patterson.ap@gmail.com</a>
S125		Liakhovskii	Sergei	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:lyakhovski.sa@gmail.com">lyakhovski.sa@gmail.com</a>
S126	S126.FS.1	Rys	Susan	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:velvita@xtra.co.nz">velvita@xtra.co.nz</a>
S127		Cochrane	Andrew & Merus	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:john.cochrane@xtra.co.nz">john.cochrane@xtra.co.nz</a>
S128		Mazur	Richard	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:richard@rhl.co.nz">richard@rhl.co.nz</a>
S129		Wakem	Leon	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:leonwakem@gmail.com">leonwakem@gmail.com</a>
S130		Turver	Chris	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:chris.turvernz@gmail.com">chris.turvernz@gmail.com</a>
S131		Maclean	Sarah	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:sfmaclean@gmail.com">sfmaclean@gmail.com</a>
S132		Hager	Mandy	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:mandy.hager72@gmail.com">mandy.hager72@gmail.com</a>
S133		Wilson	Rochelle	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:rochellewilson@xtra.co.nz">rochellewilson@xtra.co.nz</a>
S134		Smith	Jan	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:janstapletonsmith@gmail.com">janstapletonsmith@gmail.com</a>
S135		Jones	Lesley	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:llj_nz@hotmail.com">llj_nz@hotmail.com</a>
S136		Trow	Richard	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:richardmartint@gmail.com">richardmartint@gmail.com</a>
S137		Gibbons	Christine	Gibbons	Bruce	<a href="mailto:brucechristinegibbons@gmail.com">brucechristinegibbons@gmail.com</a>
S138		Holman	Linda	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:linda.holman@protonmail.com">linda.holman@protonmail.com</a>
S139		Ringrose	Paul	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:sixuppercuts@gmail.com">sixuppercuts@gmail.com</a>
S140		Dinniss	Philip	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dinnissp@gmail.com">dinnissp@gmail.com</a>
S141		van Beek	Hanne	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:hanne.design@hotmail.com">hanne.design@hotmail.com</a>
S142		Peacock	Anna	N/A	N/A	189 Main Road North, RD Waikanae
S143		Watutsi Trust	N/A	Inglis	Gail	171 Paetawa Road, RD1 Waikanae
S144		Marshall	Graeme & Christine	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:chris.graeme@hotmail.com">chris.graeme@hotmail.com</a>
S145		Cobeldick	Paul	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:plantplentymoretrees@yahoo.com">plantplentymoretrees@yahoo.com</a>
S146		SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN				
S147		Oakley	Andy	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:ajoago@gmail.com">ajoago@gmail.com</a>
S148		Hynd	Clare	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:clarehynd@xtra.co.nz">clarehynd@xtra.co.nz</a>
S149		McMahon	Frederick	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:eric_liz@xtra.co.nz">eric_liz@xtra.co.nz</a>
S150		Stevenson	Douglas	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dsskaka27@gmail.com">dsskaka27@gmail.com</a>
S151		Foster	Dan	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dfoz79@gmail.com">dfoz79@gmail.com</a>
S152		Davey	Frederick	Davey	Fred	<a href="mailto:fdavey@actrix.co.nz">fdavey@actrix.co.nz</a>
S153		Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	N/A	Gibson	David	<a href="mailto:nzisplanning.wgtn@gmail.com">nzisplanning.wgtn@gmail.com</a>
S154		Sutherland	Bruce	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:bruce.sutherland26@outlook.com">bruce.sutherland26@outlook.com</a>
S155		Cooper	Alison	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:coopercontracting@xtra.co.nz">coopercontracting@xtra.co.nz</a>
S156	S156.FS.1	Richards	Luke	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:luke.richards.kiwi@gmail.com">luke.richards.kiwi@gmail.com</a>
S157		Crosbie-Caird	Dianna	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:diannacaird@gmail.com">diannacaird@gmail.com</a>
S158	S158.FS1	Thorn	Elizabeth	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:lizzie.thorn@live.com">lizzie.thorn@live.com</a>
S159		Quentin Poole - Trustee	N/A	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:quentin@academyapparel.co.nz">quentin@academyapparel.co.nz</a>
S160	S160.FS.1 S160.FS.2 S160.FS.3	Gomez	Nancy	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:nancygomez83@msn.com">nancygomez83@msn.com</a>
S161	S161.FS.1	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	N/A	Oktem-Lewis	Onur	<a href="mailto:onur.oktem@ngatittoa.iwi.nz">onur.oktem@ngatittoa.iwi.nz</a>
S162		Lee	Angela	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:angesteph19@gmail.com">angesteph19@gmail.com</a>

Primary Sub #	Further Sub #	Submitter name		Contact person (if different)		Address for service
		Last name, or Organisation/Company/Trust name	First name	Last name (contact person)	First name (contact person)	
S163		Cooper	Dianne	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dcooper_mason@gmail.com">dcooper_mason@gmail.com</a>
S164		Reichelt	Bettina & Hartmut	Reichelt	Hartmut	<a href="mailto:tiamananz@gmail.com">tiamananz@gmail.com</a>
S165		Robertson	David	-	-	<a href="mailto:d.t.c.robertson@gmail.com">d.t.c.robertson@gmail.com</a>
S166		Munro	Steven	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:darbymunro_3@hotmail.com">darbymunro_3@hotmail.com</a>
S167		Edwards	Lorraine	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:lorraine.edwards156@gmail.com">lorraine.edwards156@gmail.com</a>
S168		Ranford & Curtis	Brian & Michelle	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:brianranford54@gmail.com">brianranford54@gmail.com</a>
S169		Smail	David	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:daviesmail@yahoo.com">daviesmail@yahoo.com</a>
S170		Kapiti Cycling Action (Kapiti Cycling Incorporated)	N/A	Baldwin	John	<a href="mailto:jelly_beansz@hotmail.com">jelly_beansz@hotmail.com</a>
S171		Lewis	Keith	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:keithlewis247@icloud.com">keithlewis247@icloud.com</a>
S172		Clode	Brian	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:brianclode@hotmail.com">brianclode@hotmail.com</a>
S173		Smith	John	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jas304@hotmail.com">jas304@hotmail.com</a>
S174		Abernethy	Evan	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:eabernethy@xtra.co.nz">eabernethy@xtra.co.nz</a>
S175		Abernethy	Sally	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:sallyabernethy@xtra.co.nz">sallyabernethy@xtra.co.nz</a>
S176		Padamsey	Salima	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:spadamsey@yahoo.com">spadamsey@yahoo.com</a>
S177	S177.FS.1	Cathie	Richard	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:r.cathie@xtra.co.nz">r.cathie@xtra.co.nz</a>
S178		O'Regan	John & Margaret	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:johnoregan28@gmail.com">johnoregan28@gmail.com</a>
S179		Dunmore	Paul	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:paul@dunmore.nz">paul@dunmore.nz</a>
S180		Ngati Haumia ki Paekakariki	N/A	Farrell	Karl	<a href="mailto:farrellwhanau@hotmail.co.nz">farrellwhanau@hotmail.co.nz</a>
S181		Nicholls	Gregory	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:gregnicholls@hotmail.com">gregnicholls@hotmail.com</a>
S182		Wilson Group Developments Otaki Ltd	N/A	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S183	S183.FS.1	Puke Ra Ltd	N/A	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S184	S184.FS.1	Watters	Jonathan & Rachel	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S185		McArthur	Angela	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:angela@eco-landscapes.co.nz">angela@eco-landscapes.co.nz</a>
S186	S186.FS.1	Gunn	Ian & Jean	Gunn	Ian	<a href="mailto:sog@xtra.co.nz">sog@xtra.co.nz</a>
S187		Rudings	Mark	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:mark@rudings.com">mark@rudings.com</a>
S188		HW Developments Ltd	N/A	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S189		Aregger	Petra	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S190	S190.FS.1	Tselentis	Evangelia Leah	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:leahlambertnz@gmail.com">leahlambertnz@gmail.com</a>
S191	S191.FS.1	Lambert	Nicholas	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:nicksing10@gmail.com">nicksing10@gmail.com</a>
S192		Stevenson-Wright	Margaret	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:faun@xtra.co.nz">faun@xtra.co.nz</a>
S193	S193.FS.1	Lambert	William	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:newpantsnewshoes@gmail.com">newpantsnewshoes@gmail.com</a>
S194		Curtis	Felicity	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:felicity.curtis@outlook.co.nz">felicity.curtis@outlook.co.nz</a>
S195		Campbell	Josephine	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:josie.campbellcalling@gmail.com">josie.campbellcalling@gmail.com</a>
S196	S196.FS.1	Ryman Healthcare Limited	N/A	Hinchey	Luke	<a href="mailto:luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com">luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com</a> <a href="mailto:marika.williams@chapmantripp.com">marika.williams@chapmantripp.com</a> <a href="mailto:hannah.okane@mitchelldaysh.co.nz">hannah.okane@mitchelldaysh.co.nz</a>
S197	S197.FS.1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	N/A	Hinchey	Luke	<a href="mailto:luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com">luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com</a> <a href="mailto:marika.williams@chapmantripp.com">marika.williams@chapmantripp.com</a> <a href="mailto:hannah.okane@mitchelldaysh.co.nz">hannah.okane@mitchelldaysh.co.nz</a>
S198		Ridley	Helen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:helenridley3@gmail.com">helenridley3@gmail.com</a>
S199		Godwin	Laurian	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:laurian@silkliving.com">laurian@silkliving.com</a>
S200		George	Christopher	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:georgec@bsd405.org">georgec@bsd405.org</a>
S201		George	Andrew	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:andrew.george@xtra.co.nz">andrew.george@xtra.co.nz</a>
S202	S202.FS.1	Leith Consulting Ltd	N/A	White	Louise	<a href="mailto:louise.w@leithconsulting.co.nz">louise.w@leithconsulting.co.nz</a>
S203	S203.FS.1	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	N/A	Hapeta	Denise	<a href="mailto:kirsten.hapeta@twor-otaki.ac.nz">kirsten.hapeta@twor-otaki.ac.nz</a>
S204		Peacock	David	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dave2mar@gmail.com">dave2mar@gmail.com</a>
S205		Classic Developments NZ Limited	N/A	Holmes	Bryce	<a href="mailto:bryce@landmatters.nz">bryce@landmatters.nz</a>

Primary Sub #	Further Sub #	Submitter name		Contact person (if different)		Address for service
		Last name, or Organisation/Company/Trust name	First name	Last name (contact person)	First name (contact person)	
S206	S206.FS.1 S206.FS.2 S206.FS.3 S206.FS.4 S206.FS.5 S206.FS.6 S206.FS.7 S206.FS.8 S206.FS.9 S206.FS.10 S206.FS.11 S206.FS.12 S206.FS.13 S206.FS.14	Landlink	N/A	Turner, Payne & Clafferty	Paul, Marie & Jenny	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S207	S207.FS.1	Mettifecare Limited	N/A	Tree	Bianca	<a href="mailto:bianca.tree@minterellison.co.nz">bianca.tree@minterellison.co.nz</a>
S208		Landlink (and TBC)	N/A	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S209	S209.FS.1	Osborne	Vince/Eric	Turner & Payne (Landlink)	Paul & Marie	<a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a>
S210		Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira (A.R.T)	N/A	Gibb, Oktem & Hapeta	Claire, Onur & Kirsten	<a href="mailto:claire@tekonae.co.nz">claire@tekonae.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:onur.oktem@ngatitoea.iwi.nz">onur.oktem@ngatitoea.iwi.nz</a> <a href="mailto:kiriona7@gmail.com">kiriona7@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:taiao@teatiawakikapiti.co.nz">taiao@teatiawakikapiti.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:office@ngahapuootaki.nz">office@ngahapuootaki.nz</a> <a href="mailto:admin@teatiawakikapiti.co.nz">admin@teatiawakikapiti.co.nz</a>
S211		Easterbrook-Smith	Sonja	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:easterbrooksmithsj@gmail.com">easterbrooksmithsj@gmail.com</a>
S212		Neumann	Stefanie	N/A	N/A	109A Alexander Road, Raumati South
S213		Middleton	Daniel	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dan.middleton07@gmail.com">dan.middleton07@gmail.com</a>
S214		Chrisp	Prue	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:pruechrisp@gmail.com">pruechrisp@gmail.com</a>
S215		Queree	Neville	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:uniman01@gmail.com">uniman01@gmail.com</a>
S216		Webber	Allison	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:alliewebber@outlook.com">alliewebber@outlook.com</a>
S217		Frauenstein	Martin	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:martin@frauenstein.net">martin@frauenstein.net</a>
S218		Coastal Ratepayers United Inc	N/A	Padamsey	Salima	<a href="mailto:spadamsey@yahoo.com">spadamsey@yahoo.com</a>
S219		Poole	Sally	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:sally@academyapparel.co.nz">sally@academyapparel.co.nz</a>
<b>Submitters that lodged further submissions only</b>						
	S220.FS.1	Boyd	Jacob	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jacobboydzn@gmail.com">jacobboydzn@gmail.com</a>
	S221.FS.1	Crow	Adam	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:adam.crow@outlook.com">adam.crow@outlook.com</a>
	S222.FS.1	Turner	Paul	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:pgeoffreyt@gmail.com">pgeoffreyt@gmail.com</a>
	S223.FS.1	de Jongh	Barbara	O'Kane	Deborah	<a href="mailto:deb.okane@gmail.com">deb.okane@gmail.com</a>
	S224.FS.1 S224.FS.2 S224.FS.3	Simpson	Vanessa & Guy	Simpson	Guy	<a href="mailto:guysimpson@xtra.co.nz">guysimpson@xtra.co.nz</a>
	S225.FS.1 S225.FS.2	Tate	Karen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:karen.p.tate@gmail.com">karen.p.tate@gmail.com</a>
	S226.FS.1	Kotrotsos	Androulla	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:androulla@xtra.xo.nz">androulla@xtra.xo.nz</a>
	S227.FS.1	Tocker	John	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:john@tictoc.nz">john@tictoc.nz</a>
	S228.FS.1	Terry	Grace	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:gracem.terry@gmail.com">gracem.terry@gmail.com</a>
	S229.FS.1	Palmer	Viola	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:phvcpalmer@gmail.com">phvcpalmer@gmail.com</a>
	S230.FS.1	Housiaux	Virginia	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:bitsnpieces42@yahoo.com">bitsnpieces42@yahoo.com</a>
	S231.FS.1	Fleming	Jean	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:treetops139@gmail.com">treetops139@gmail.com</a>
	S232.FS.1	Foote & TMA 2007 Ltd	Jacinda & Daniel	Foote	Jacinda (Cindy)	<a href="mailto:cindy@jadepm.co.nz">cindy@jadepm.co.nz</a>
	S233.FS.1	Helson	Lindsay	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:gawnburger@gmail.com">gawnburger@gmail.com</a>
	S234.FS.1	Rau	Leigh	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:leigh@kanikanikids.maori.nz">leigh@kanikanikids.maori.nz</a>
	S235.FS.1	Morris	Brent & Leanne	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:cottagetails@xtra.co.nz">cottagetails@xtra.co.nz</a>
	S236.FS.1 S236.FS.2 S236.FS.3 S236.FS.4 S236.FS.5	George & Fenwick	Megan & Ian	George	Megan	<a href="mailto:georgefenwickfamily@gmail.com">georgefenwickfamily@gmail.com</a>
	S237.FS.1	Milsom	Shona	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:shona.milsom@gmail.com">shona.milsom@gmail.com</a>
	S238.FS.1	Heads	Ann	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:ann.heads@gmail.com">ann.heads@gmail.com</a>

Primary Sub #	Further Sub #	Submitter name		Contact person (if different)		Address for service
		Last name, or Organisation/Company/Trust name	First name	Last name (contact person)	First name (contact person)	
	S239.FS.1	Gavin	Michelle	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:chellesg@icloud.com">chellesg@icloud.com</a>
	S240.FS.1	White	Anne	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:anne.white@xtra.co.nz">anne.white@xtra.co.nz</a>
	S241.FS.1	Jones	Steve & Sue	Payne & Turner (Landlink Ltd)	Marie & Paul	<a href="mailto:marie@landlink.co.nz">marie@landlink.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:paul@landlink.co.nz">paul@landlink.co.nz</a>
	S243.FS.1	Doyle	Kirsty & Steve	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:skedoyle@gmail.com">skedoyle@gmail.com</a>
	S244.FS.1	McDonald	Deidre	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:dee.macdonald11@gmail.com">dee.macdonald11@gmail.com</a>
	S245.FS.1	Devery	Barbara	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:ledson@xtra.co.nz">ledson@xtra.co.nz</a>
	S247.FS.1	Xiong	Zhen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:zhenxionghuang1949@gmail.com">zhenxionghuang1949@gmail.com</a>
	S248.FS.1	Davis	Shane	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:7shanedavis@gmail.com">7shanedavis@gmail.com</a>
	S249.FS.1	Francis	Elizabeth	Francis	Liz	<a href="mailto:l.francis.nz@gmail.com">l.francis.nz@gmail.com</a>
	S250.FS.1	Hudson	Matt	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:smpropertydevelopment@gmail.com">smpropertydevelopment@gmail.com</a>
	S251.FS.1	Dai	Karen	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:karen_0509@icloud.com">karen_0509@icloud.com</a>
	S252.FS.1	Low Carbon Kāpiti	N/A	Roos	Jake	<a href="mailto:info@lowcarbonkapiti.org.nz">info@lowcarbonkapiti.org.nz</a>
	S253.FS.1	Ngan	Jessica	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jessicang364@gmail.com">jessicang364@gmail.com</a>
	S254.FS.1	Huang	Nancy	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:nancyhxd@gmail.com">nancyhxd@gmail.com</a>
	S255.FS.1	Dai	Guo	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:quoxuandai@gmail.com">quoxuandai@gmail.com</a>
	S256.FS.1	?	Kuishui	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:kuishui@gmail.com">kuishui@gmail.com</a>
	S257.FS.1	Wei	Bilan	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:weibilan2@gmail.com">weibilan2@gmail.com</a>
	S258.FS.1	Thompson	Hannah	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:hannah.tho404@gmail.com">hannah.tho404@gmail.com</a>
	S259.FS.1	Campbell & Susan Ross Trust	N/A	Ross	Dr Harry Campbell	<a href="mailto:sueandcampbellross@gmail.com">sueandcampbellross@gmail.com</a>



**Appendix C: Recommendations Table**  
Organised by primary submission number

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S001	S001.01	Dyer, Mary	Design Guides	Not specified	The Design Guides provide for "internal design that caters for people of all ages and abilities", however it is not clear how this is to be achieved in relation to stairs.  For a percentage of the population, getting up and down stairs can be unsafe. This includes the visually impaired, disabled, and others with physical problems like obesity, vertigo etc.  The submission also includes information from the United Kingdom, Europe, Canada and the United States on the hazards and risks related to stairs.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to require that a percentage of new housing be single storey for people for which stairs would be a hazard.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	While the relief sought by the submitter is well intentioned, I consider that requiring a certain percentage of new housing to be single storey would be contrary to the requirement under clause 11 of Schedule 3A of the RMA to permit buildings up to 11m tall, and the policy stated under clause 6(2)(a) to enable 3-storey dwellings.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S001.01.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	Submitter has requested that a percentage of new housing be single storey for people for which stairs would be a hazard. Submitter opposes this request as there are other methods for achieving accessibility for people within a home. This matter should be dealt with under the Building Code/Building Act regarding accessibility for those that are physically impaired. However, since the design guide has mentioned internal design for 'all ages and abilities' it should elaborate on how this should be achieved or delete this reference entirely. Additional clarification or guidance should be provided to improve clarity and understanding on how this should be achieved (e.g chair lifts, stair design, etc)	Allow primary submission in part. Request that part of the submission seeking how the Design Guides will provide for "internal design that caters for people of all ages and abilities" be allowed.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S001	S001.02	Dyer, Mary	Design Guides	Not specified	See submission point S001.01.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to require that stairs in terrace and multi-storeyed housing are not just to be within the standard ratio of tread to rise, but have the right and more relaxed ratio that makes it safer and easier if people with limited ability have to use them.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The design of stairs for safety and accessibility (including the ratio of tread to rise) is regulated under the Building Act 2004 and Clause D1 of the New Zealand Building Code. While the relief sought by the submitter is well intentioned and based on sound reasoning, I consider that it would not be appropriate for the same matter to be regulated by the District Plan.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S001	S001.03	Dyer, Mary	Design Guides	Not specified	See submission point S001.01.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to require that terraced and multi-storeyed housing and subdivisions are not advertised as being purely built for retired people or purely built for people with limited abilities.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I do not consider that regulating how terraced and multi-storey developments are advertised or marketed falls within the functions of the Council under s31 of the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S002	S002.01	Fleming, Michael	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	The existing drinking-water, sewerage and stormwater infrastructure within the Kāpiti Coast district purportedly lacks the capacity to sustain the existing population.	<b>Physically install</b> new drinking water, sewerage and stormwater infrastructure of sufficient capacity to easily accommodate for future increases in population.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I do not consider that this matter can be addressed through the District Plan. Rather, I consider that this matter is more appropriately addressed through the Council's Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy. I also observe that the Council's Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment identifies that there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure capacity to provide for the existing population, and anticipated population growth over at least the medium term (10 years).	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that I consider this matter is most appropriately addressed through the LTP and Infrastructure Strategy.	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S002.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	As stated in the submitters primary submission, NHO oppose the enabling of development on the basis of "planned" infrastructure. It is critical that the provision of infrastructure is proactively managed to support development, in conjunction with or in advance of housing development. The provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure and the design of urban form is foundational to the delivery of housing and intensification. Decision sought: Inclusion of Infrastructure as a new Qualifying Matter.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S002	S002.02	Fleming, Michael	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	Implementing changes to the District Plan will purportedly exponentially increase rates to cover the costs of installing sufficient three-waters infrastructure to isolated high population density property development.	<b>Financially recover</b> the cost of future three-waters infrastructure from the property owners of future high density population property developments.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider that the ability to recover the costs associated with the provision of infrastructure is provided for through development contributions (under the Council's Development Contributions Policy and the Local Government Act 2002). If there are circumstances where the Council's Development Contributions Policy is not applicable, then the Council may apply financial contributions (under the District Plan and the RMA) as a condition of a resource consent. I therefore consider that there are appropriate means available to the Council to recover costs associated with the provision of infrastructure.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that I consider that this matter is already provided for.	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S002.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	As stated in the submitters primary submission, NHO oppose the enabling of development on the basis of "planned" infrastructure. It is critical that the provision of infrastructure is proactively managed to support development, in conjunction with or in advance of housing development. The provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure and the design of urban form is foundational to the delivery of housing and intensification. Decision sought: Inclusion of Infrastructure as a new Qualifying Matter.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S002.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Full submission	Support primary submission	As stated in the submitters primary submission, Ātiawa oppose the enabling of development on the basis of "planned" infrastructure. It is critical that the provision of infrastructure is proactively managed to support development, in conjunction with or in advance of housing development. The provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure and the design of urban form is foundational to the delivery of housing and intensification. Decision sought: Inclusion of Infrastructure as a new Qualifying Matter.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S003	S003.01	Gazula, Sri	Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Not specified	The submission seeks that an area of land located to the north of Rahui Road and west of Freemans Road in Ōtaki from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone.  The land is located closer to the main road and railway station than other areas proposed to be rezoned as General Residential Zone. Services are available in the area, and the area is within a walkable distance of amenities.	<b>Rezone</b> the area of land to the north of Rahui Road and west of Freemans Road in Ōtaki from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone. The extent of the rezoning sought is identified on a map included with the submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S234.FS.1	S003.01.FS01	Rau, Leigh	Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose primary submission	Oppose submission S003. The submitter has concerns regarding the pace at which green spaces are being lost, and the physical environment being adversely affected alongside the character of the town. Rezoning this area will impact on Papatūānuku. Some of the area is mapped as 'ponding' and cannot be built on anyway. This land should remain zoned as Rural Production.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S237.FS.1	S003.01.FS02	Milom, Shona	Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the rezoning of Rahui Road. Rural 'green' area need to be kept for future generations to enjoy. There are further blocks along Te Roto Road that are similar, but no reference has been made to these.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S243.FS.1	S003.01.FS03	Doyle, Kirsty and Steve	Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the rezoning of Rahui Road to General Residential. Green space which should remain this way. KCDC have previously said they want to keep the rural character of this area. Concerns regarding the wildlife that lives here and the waterways which are being improved. Large part of this land is a ponding zone.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S003.01.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose primary submission	This area is culturally significant land to our hapū with a waterway running through it. Not a viable option at all. Low lying area that is highly flood prone. Also currently a ponding area. The reason is that the culvert that runs under the old railway line is a choke point. Restrictor point. See also the main points of the NHO submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S004	S004.01	Averi, Peter	106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support	The submission supports the proposal to re-zone 184-186 Milne Drive from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.	<b>Approve</b> the proposed rezoning of 184-186 Milne Drive as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S248.FS.1	S004.01.FS01	Davis, Shane	106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Support the rezoning of land in Milne Drive to General Residential. This area meets the high priority requirement for greenfield sites to be located adjoining existing urban areas. Creating more land for development supports the urbanisation of Paraparaumu, and the properties are already in a residential area.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S005	S005.01	Kilbride, James	General	Support	The submission supports the proposed plan change. In particular, the submission supports: - acknowledging that the character of Paekākāriki is changing, and increasing housing variety and choice is encouraged; - Paekākāriki needs more diverse housing options; - enabling higher density development near Paekākāriki station and other train stations encourages development that will be less dependent on private travel options.	Approve Plan Change 2 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Subject to recommendations to amend PC(N) made throughout this document.	No.
S006	S006.01	Webster, Stuart Gordon and Coral Lillain	106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support	The submissions supports the proposed rezoning, as it is consistent with the growth and intensification plans of the region and rezoning of the land provides the opportunity to create new housing close to Paraparaumu services and amenities. The submission indicates that there is agreement amongst other landowners in the area that they could work together to create new lots that get the best use of the land.	Approve the proposed rezoning of 106 - 188 Milne Drive as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S248.FS.1	S006.01.FS01	Davis, Shane	106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Support the rezoning of land in Milne Drive to General Residential. This area meets the high priority requirement for greenfield sites to be located adjoining existing urban areas. Creating more land for development supports the urbanisation of Paraparaumu, and the properties are already in a residential area.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S007	S007.01	Watson, Hillary and Stephen	General Residential Zone: Introduction, GRZ-P6	Oppose	The submitter made a positive decision to move to the Waikanae Garden Precinct because of its feeling of peace, low density housing, green space and proximity to amenities, and has since invested emotion, time, energy and money in their property. They made these decisions based on the expectation that the Waikanae Garden Precinct would remain largely as it is.  The proposed construction of three and in some places 6 storey buildings is horrifying, and once destroyed, the character of these areas will never be replaceable. The thought of neighbours being able to erect tall, high density housing on the submitters boundaries, without consultation, is profoundly depressing. The effects on light, privacy and the environment would be unacceptably detrimental.	Reject the proposal for infill housing and maintain the integrity and protection of the Waikanae Garden Precinct and its environs, as well as the Waikanae Beach area.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.  I note that PC2 includes policy GRZ-P5, which specifies a range of characteristics that must be considered in the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, in circumstances where development requires a resource consent for breaching permitted activity standards (in other words, where development is of a higher density than that enabled by the MDRS). I also note that notification of neighbours may be required in circumstances where development breaches density standards (for example, where the development is located close to the boundary and breaches setback, height or height in relation to boundary standards).	Do not accept.	No.
S008	S008.01	McIntyre, Mark	12 Waitohu Valley Road, Ōtaki	Not specified	The submitter supports the proposal to rezone land as General Residential Zone, and seeks that their property is also rezoned.  The property is identified as being within a "medium-priority greenfield growth area" in "Te tupu pai - Growing Well", and within Future Urban Study Area ŌT-04 of the Kāpiti Coast Urban Development Greenfield Assessment [the submission refers to the Kāpiti Coast Urban Development Intensification Assessment, however based on the subject of the submission it is inferred that the submission intended to refer to the Greenfield Assessment].  The site meets the criteria identified in PC2 for inclusion within the General Residential Zone. Specifically: - The site is located next to an existing urban area and adjacent to water supply and wastewater services; - Part of the site is subject to flood hazard, however development would need to meet the provisions for flood hazards outlined in the District Plan; - While the site is located adjacent a stream, development would be subject to the requirements of the district plan, regional plan and NES-F; - The site is a fragmented part of the medium term growth area and not sufficiently large or complex enough to require a structure planned approach; - The site could provide a notable contribution to residential development capacity; - Rezoning is consistent with and gives effect to policies 1 and 3 of the NPS-UD.  The submitter notes that the issues associated with natural hazards and highly productive land identified in the Greenfield Assessment that apply in the area more broadly do not apply (or apply to a lesser extent) to the site.	Rezone 12 Waitohu Valley Road (Lot 2 DP 59205) as General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S008.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	12 Waitohu Valley Road, Ōtaki	Oppose primary submission	NHoO do not support rezoning of this lands at this time as per the points in the NHoO submission including: NHoO recommendation that Ōtaki is not designated a future Urban Zone. The important work of clearly defining what (population and development) our waterways and environment can safely sustain be completed before any further intensification. A detailed development plan including infrastructure development and prescribed building rules be completed before further intensification. NHoO request that an infrastructure qualifying matter be applied to Ōtaki. Also thorough site specific investigation is imperative before any rezoning. Flood hazard and next to an important waterway.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S009	S009.01	Callister, Dr. Paul	General - Kāpiti Airport	Not specified	The submission argues that the airport needs to close, with the area turned into medium to high density housing.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this matter to be within the scope of PC2.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S009	S009.02	Callister, Dr. Paul	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	The submission argues that high density housing reduces car dependency, but people still need mobility. It is important that cycling, walking, as well as regular, affordable, high quality public transport are at the centre of transport planning for higher density housing.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Submission is noted.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S009	S009.03	Callister, Dr. Paul	General - Housing variety and choice	Not specified	Tiny houses are alternative, low cost, low impact, healthy housing initiative which can contribute to densification as well as housing affordability.	Include "tiny houses" as part of adopting a housing densification plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that "tiny houses", as described by the submitter, would meet the definition of residential unit and building under the operative District Plan. On this basis, I consider that "tiny houses" are enabled by PC2.  I also note that the relocation of buildings (including "tiny houses") is provided for as a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider that PC(N) already provides for "tiny houses".	No.
S054.FS.1	S009.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Housing variety and choice	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Tiny homes is a viable option as part of the housing crisis solution.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S010	S010.01	Xu, Xiang and Xiong, Shimin	106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support	The submissions supports the proposed rezoning, as it is consistent with the growth and intensification plans of the region and rezoning of the land provides the opportunity to create new housing close to Paraparaumu services and amenities. The submission indicates that there is agreement amongst other landowners in the area that they could work together to create new lots that get the best use of the land.	Approve the proposed rezoning of 106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S248.FS.1	S010.01.FS01	Davis, Shane	106 - 188 Milne Drive, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Support the rezoning of land in Milne Drive to General Residential. This area meets the high priority requirement for greenfield sites to be located adjoining existing urban areas. Creating more land for development supports the urbanisation of Paraparaumu, and the properties are already in a residential area.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S011	S011.01	Kress, Sahra	General - Kāpiti Airport	Not specified	The submission argues that the airport needs to close, with the area turned into medium to high density housing.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this matter to be within the scope of PC2.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S011	S011.02	Kress, Sahra	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	The submission argues that high density housing reduces car dependency, but people still need mobility. It is important that cycling, walking, as well as regular, affordable, high quality public transport are at the centre of transport planning for higher density housing.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Submission is noted.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S011	S011.03	Kress, Sahra	General - Housing variety and choice	Support in part	The submission advocates for 'tiny houses' as an alternative, low cost, low impact, healthy housing initiative which can contribute to densification as well as housing affordability.  'Tiny houses' are moveable dwellings, built to building code standards with permanent building materials. These small dwellings are now ubiquitous nationally (indeed, internationally) and offer affordable, healthy housing for people, typically younger people, families including those with young children, and some older retired folk. They are an ideal response to the housing crisis and looking after the most disadvantaged people in our community.	Include "tiny houses" as part of adopting a housing densification plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that "tiny houses", as described by the submitter, would meet the definition of residential unit and building under the operative District Plan. On this basis, I consider that "tiny houses" are enabled by PC2.  I also note that the relocation of buildings (including "tiny houses") is provided for as a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider that PC(N) already provides for "tiny houses".	No.
S054.FS.1	S011.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Housing variety and choice	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Tiny homes are a viable option as part of the housing crisis solution.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S011	S011.04	Kress, Sahra	General	Support	The submission supports the specific proposal to encourage tangata whenua to develop papakāinga housing.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S012	S012.01	Bulletin Trust	99 and 103 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Not specified	The submission opposes the General Rural zoning of the property at 99 and 103 State Highway 1, Waikanae.  General Residential Zone is the most appropriate zone for the site because: a) The site is identified in <i>Te Tupu Pai - Growing Well</i> as part of a "medium priority greenfield growth area". b) The site is within a "future urban area" in the <i>Wellington Regional Growth Framework</i> . c) Site investigations confirm that residential development can be undertaken in a manner that avoids, remedies or mitigates constraints. d) The site is located within 1km of the edge of the Waikanae Town Centre and within a 2km radius of the train station, two primary schools and recreation opportunities. e) The site is located within easy walking distance of key amenities. f) Residential development on the site will achieve a positive interface with emerging adjacent residential development, as well as maintaining the amenity and operational functions of surrounding rural properties. g) Development of the site could yield approximately 400 dwellings with a range of typologies and tenure types. h) Rezoning the site is inherently consistent with the NPS-UD. i) The site can be serviced by existing or planned infrastructure. j) Site investigations have confirmed that flood hazard risk can be appropriately mitigated on site. k) Site investigations have confirmed that the site can be developed to align with the intent of the NPS-FM. l) Potential effects on an ecological site can be appropriately managed through existing District Plan rules.  A draft development plan is attached to the submission.	Rezone the site to General Residential Zone or any other zone that will enable the development proposed in the submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S054.FS.1	S012.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	99 and 103 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission. SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first - to allow for much greater housing intensification - the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents - make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built) - reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station - when the railway line is further electrified to Otaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access - this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S100.FS.1	S012.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	99 and 103 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	These sites are subject to flooding risk. They should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Retain existing zoning	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S013	S013.01	Pearson, Tania	160-222 Main Road, Paraparaumu	Support	The submission supports the rezoning of the area at 168 Main Road, Raumati South, to General Residential Zone, although they would not like to see their rates increase due only to having their property rezoned.	Approve the proposed rezoning of the area as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S013.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	160-222 Main Road, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S014	S014.01	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	General	Not specified	The submission expresses its support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety (refer to S197).	Refer to S197.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to S197.	Refer to S197.	Refer to S197.
S100.FS.1	S014.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Support primary submission	Ātiawa supports the provision of housing and care facilities within retirement villages. They recognise the unique nature of those facilities and the role they play in communities. Ātiawa also recognise that they form part of the community and, as with other activities they have effects that need to be assessed and avoided, remedies or mitigated. Ātiawa therefore oppose the proposal to exempt retirement villages from design criteria, enable increased densities and preclude notification. Recognise, within PC2, the role of retirement villages within our communities and provide design criteria or require structure plans relevant to the activity.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S015	S015.01	Manhire, William	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.</p> <p>The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.</p> <p>The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.</p> <p>The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.</p> <p>The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.</p> <p>The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.</p>	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S015.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S015.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged areas as they have been identified with potential of being affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S015	S015.02	Manhire, William	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.</p> <p>The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.</p>	Alternatively, if submission S015.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S015.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that the Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S015	S015.03	Manhire, William	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S015.01 and S015.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S015	S015.04	Manhire, William	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S015.01 and S015.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S016	S016.01	Mann, Amos	Design Guides	Not specified	The District Plan must empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones. 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. 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.	Amend the Design Guides to include accessibility and universal design requirements.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	<p>The notified Design Guides include the principle "provide accessible external and internal design that caters for people of all ages and abilities" (Residential Design Guide and Centres Design Guide, p4). This is provided for through guideline 13 in the notified Residential Design Guide and guideline 17 of the notified Centres Design Guide.</p> <p>I also note that the accessibility of access routes to and within buildings is a matter that is regulated under the Building Act 2004 and clause D1 of the New Zealand Building Code.</p> <p>To the extent that it is appropriate to provide for accessibility and universal design under the District Plan, I consider the relief requested by the submitter is already provided for by the notified Design Guides.</p>	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.11	S016.01.FS01	Landlink	Design Guides	Support primary submission	The consideration of accessibility and universal design requirements would potentially help improve the resilience of the housing stock and meet the Districts' objectives in terms of choice and the broader implementation of the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S016	S016.02	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Provide for easier consenting and incentives for accessible and eco-friendly developments.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought by the submitter, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.  However, I note that by incorporating the MDRS, PC2 generally reduces consenting requirements for all residential development/  While I note that matters related to building accessibility and energy efficiency are regulated under the New Zealand Building Code, I note that the Residential and Centres Design Guides incorporate guidelines that seek to encourage accessibility and energy efficiency as part of the broader design of development.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider PC(N) generally provides for these matters.	No.
S206.FS.11	S016.02.FS01	Landlink	General	Support primary submission	Note that 'easier' consenting is subjective but agree with the sentiment that to give full effect to the NPS-UD - particularly Policies 1(e)(f), and Policy 6. These policies are intrinsic in the implementation of other policies e.g. Policy 3 which are sought to be given effect through the IPI. Incentives for sustainable and eco-friendly developments should be explored further (note feedback on Plan Change 1E). Currently do not believe the Plan Change translates to action in achieving Objective 8 of the NPS-UD and relevant policies.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S016	S016.03	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Provide for incentives for lifts in multi-storey developments.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought by the submitter, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.  However, in relation to District Plan acknowledgement of lifts, I note that under PC2, elevators (which can project above a building's roof line) are excluded from building height standards in the Residential Intensification Precincts of the General Residential Zone, as well as the centres, Mixed Use and Hospital Zones.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider PC(N) already provides for elevators in relation to multi-storey development.	No.
S016	S016.04	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Prioritise emissions reduction, better quality of life, and community cohesion and resilience.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	By providing for increased levels of development near to centres and rapid transit stops, I consider that PC2 already has regard to these matters.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider PC(N) generally provides for these matters.	No.
S206.FS.11	S016.04.FS01	Landlink	General	Support primary submission	Note that 'easier' consenting is subjective but agree with the sentiment that to give full effect to the NPS-UD - particularly Policies 1(e)(f), and Policy 6. These policies are intrinsic in the implementation of other policies e.g. Policy 3 which are sought to be given effect through the IPI. Incentives for sustainable and eco-friendly developments should be explored further (note feedback on Plan Change 1E). Currently do not believe the Plan Change translates to action in achieving Objective 8 of the NPS-UD and relevant policies.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S016	S016.05	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Provide for multi-functional community spaces within centres as Climate Action Hubs.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that such activities could be provided for as community facilities under the provisions of the Community Facilities chapter.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider the District Plan already provides for these activities.	No.
S016	S016.06	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Integrate circular economy principles into the District Plan so that waste is minimised and designed out of construction projects.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what provisions are sought to be incorporated into the District Plan with respect to waste minimisation in construction projects, and the submitter may wish to clarify this at the hearing.  I consider that research, analysis and evaluation would be required in order to develop appropriate provisions, and I consider this to be beyond the scope of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S016	S016.07	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Provide for green spaces that are recreational, food producing and support biodiversity.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I note that the District Plan includes a range of areas zoned for open space, and requires reserves contributions as part of new development, I consider that the provision of open space is principally addressed as part of the Council's Long-term Plan and under the Council's Open Space Strategy.	Do not accept. Noting I consider that open space provision is addressed through a range of District Plan provisions, as well as the Council's Open Space Strategy.	No.
S016	S016.08	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Support the creation of a sustainable and resilient local food and biodiversity network.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that arable farming is provided for as a permitted activity within the General Residential Zone, and I consider this could support the development of local food networks.  I note that there are a range of provisions in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter of the District Plan that address biodiversity, including protections for ecological sites and key indigenous trees.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider these matters are addressed by the District Plan.	No.
S054.FS.1	S016.08.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Need to safeguard local productive food growing resources, including: - mature food producing trees on private property; - food producing trees on public/shared property; - resourcing local food growing initiatives that serve the community at lower cost, and lower transport cost. Need to protect sources of sunlight and water, soils. Seek an amendment that protects local food resilience resources as a Qualifying Matter.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S016	S016.09	Mann, Amos	General	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Incorporate bicycle and micro-mobility device parking requirements for commercial and community facilities in the Centres and Mixed Use Zones.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I note that rule TR-PARK-R19 (which is proposed to be incorporated in the District Plan under Plan Change 1C) will require the provision of bicycle parking for a range of commercial activities and community facilities in the Centres and Mixed Use Zones.  I am unclear what specific requirements are sought in relation to micro mobility device parking, or whether these are necessary as part of incorporating the MDRS and giving effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, and I therefore do not consider it appropriate to recommend incorporating any specific requirements into the District Plan.	Do not accept. Noting that bicycle parking requirements are already addressed through Plan Change 1C.	No.
S054.FS.1	S016.09.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S016	S016.10	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx1	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Amend the height in relation to boundary standard to align with the Coalition for More Homes Proposed Medium Density Standards: - First 20m from frontage: no standard; - Beyond 20m from frontage: 3m high at site boundary + 45 degrees.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendments sought are inconsistent with the height in relation to boundary standard required by the MDRS, and are less enabling of development (in relation to the area beyond 20m from the frontage).  I also consider this to be an "other density standard" restricted under clause 2(2) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.	Do not accept.	No.
S016	S016.11	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx1	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	Add a minimum permeability standard (30% - 40%).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Standard 2 under rule GRZ-R1 already provides for a minimum permeability standard of 30% of the total allotment area.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S016	S016.12	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx1	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	<b>Amend</b> the outdoor living space standard to align with the Coalition for More Homes Proposed Medium Density Standards: - 20% of the unit size for the house at ground floor, with a minimum dimension of 3m; - 15% for houses with no ground floor per floor, with a minimum dimension of 1.8m.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendments sought are inconsistent with the outdoor living space standard required by the MDRS, because (depending on the size of the residential unit) it would require outdoor living space areas larger than those required by the MDRS standard.  I also consider this to be an "other density standard" restricted under clause 2(2) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S016	S016.13	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx1	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	<b>Amend</b> the landscape area standard to align with the Coalition for More Homes Proposed Medium Density Standards: - Minimum 35% landscaped area; or - 1 tree per unit with a 3m x 3m unobstructed area to allow the tree to achieve maturity. If the development keeps an existing mature tree within the design then this can be traded in place of a tree required under this standard; or - A 6 metre setback from the rear boundary.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendments sought are inconsistent with the landscape area standard required by the MDRS, because they require a greater landscape area, or larger building setbacks, than those required by the MDRS standard.  I also consider this to be an "other density standard" restricted under clause 2(2) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S016.13.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S016	S016.14	Mann, Amos	General Residential Zone	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	<b>Provide for</b> small scale commercial activity is a permitted or controlled activity. Increase the scale of commercial activity permitted in these areas.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Small scale commercial activity (in the form of local convenience retail outlets) is provided for as a restricted discretionary activity in the General Residential Zone under rule GRZ-R14. I do not consider it appropriate to increase the scale of commercial activities in the General Residential Zone, as this would be consistent with several objectives and policies that seek to focus commercial activities in the District's centres and Mixed Use Zones (including objective DO-O16 and the policies of the Business Activities chapter).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S016	S016.15	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx2	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	<b>Increase</b> height limits within 15 minute walking catchments of railway stations to enable larger, more comprehensive developments in centres.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	In my view, this would involve increasing the size of Residential Intensification Precinct A from being based on an 800 metre walkable catchment to being based on a 1,200 metre walkable catchment.  I consider that there is unlikely to be any substantial benefit to increasing the size of the Residential Intensification Precincts. I note that the analysis of the feasibility and realisability of development within the precinct (outlined in Appendix M to the Section 32 Evaluation Report) identifies that overall there is likely to be a low realisation of apartment development in these areas. I also consider that increasing the size of the precincts would not contribute towards promoting higher density residential development in areas close to centres and rapid transit stops because it would enable such development (which is already not considered to be highly realisable) to be undertaken further away from these locations. Taking these matters into account, I do not consider that increasing the size of the Residential Intensification Precincts is justified.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S016	S016.16	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx2	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	<b>Add</b> a standard requiring developments to adequately accommodate active travel and universal accessibility.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that Plan Change 1C seeks to incorporate standards for cycle parking into the Transport chapter of the District Plan. This would introduce requirements to incorporate cycle parking into a range of developments (including commercial and multi-unit residential developments).  In relation to accessibility, I consider that this matter is principally regulated under the New Zealand Building Code.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that I consider these matters are addressed by Plan Change 1C or the New Zealand Building Code.	<b>No.</b>
S016	S016.17	Mann, Amos	GRZ-Rx2	Not specified	See submission point S016.01.	<b>Enable</b> small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to my assessment of S016.14.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S016	S016.18	Mann, Amos	General - Housing variety and choice	Not specified	Co-housing, tiny-housing and Papakāinga 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.	<b>Amend</b> the District Plan to support a diverse range of housing alternatives with specific planning that incentivises and attracts co-housing, tiny-housing and Papakāinga projects.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider these matters are already addressed either by the operative District Plan, or by PC2. I do not consider any amendments are necessary to address the matters raised by the submitter.  In relation to co-housing, I consider this is already provided for as <i>shared and group accommodation</i> , which is a permitted activity (subject to standards) in the General Residential Zone under rule GRZ-R4.  In relation to tiny-housing, I consider that this is enabled by PC2 (refer to my assessment under submission point S009.03).  In relation to papakāinga, PC2 includes a range of provisions that seek to enable tangata whenua to develop papakāinga on ancestral land.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S016.18.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Housing variety and choice	Support primary submission	Support this submission. <i>Tiny homes is a viable option as part of the housing crisis solution.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S017	S017.01	Shroff, Gordon	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	Seeking to apply the MDRS provisions to low lying coastal areas in Kāpiti is overly zealous, if not reckless. The Council has failed to adopt a coherent precautionary approach towards all known and scientifically documented hazards, particularly inundation arising from interlinked sea level rise, geomorphic subsidence and groundwater rise.  PC2 proposes to address coastal inundation by invalid use of Building Act provisions.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S017	S017.02	Shroff, Gordon	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission point S017.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S018	S018.01	Macleay Street Apartments	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission is on behalf of the body corporate of a 12 unit apartment complex which includes two retail outlets at Paraparaumu Beach. The submission states several reasons including (but not limited to): - The submission supports the principle that coastal beach areas be classified as Coastal Qualifying Matters and support the continuation of the status quo with regard to the height limit in the beach areas. The status quo should be maintained in areas identified as susceptible to coastal erosion hazard, which most of the beach areas are. - Paraparaumu Beach is also a tsunami and flood hazard area. A tsunami hitting an area with high intensification will cause untold damage to people and property. - Due to climate change and coastal erosion, central Government's policy has been to encourage people to move away from the beach wherever possible. Intensification would be contradictory to that policy. - Intensification will see increased traffic and the safety of children and older residents may be compromised. - Under PC2 there is no requirement to supply off street parking for new developments. This would mean an increase in car parking on streets where older residents reside, and where visitors and families play around the beach area. Parking space is critical for the many small businesses in Paraparaumu Beach, and residents. - All residents as far as practicable should be able to enjoy the views of Kāpiti Island and the surrounding environments. Having a row of six storey buildings along the waterfront will spoil the enjoyment of the area for existing residents and visitors. The submission building heights on the waterfront remain as they are with the heights gradually increasing to six stories as you go inland.	Amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include the beach areas of Kāpiti, and retain existing building heights as they are currently.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I am unclear as to the spatial extent of the additional areas sought to be added to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct through the submission, however I note that I have considered several different spatial extents for the precinct in response to other submissions, and consider these to be less appropriate than the notified extent of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S018.01.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S018.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	All residents as far as practicable should be able to enjoy the views of Kāpiti Island (a significant cultural site). Climate change and coastal hazards including erosion, inundation, tsunami risks etc provide the basis of this and our argument to not increase building heights in coastal beach areas. Amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include the beach areas of Kāpiti coast, and retain existing building heights as they are currently.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S018	S018.02	Macleay Street Apartments	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	The submission notes that Raumati South and Waikanae Beach are proposed as Local Centre zones and keep the status quo while Paraparaumu Beach is to be classified as a Town Centre area. We are deeply perplexed by this as all three have similar coastal and transport conditions and we would appreciate an explanation. Paraparaumu Beach should be classified as a Local Centre area the same as Raumati South and Waikanae Beaches.	Rezone Paraparaumu Beach as a Local Centre Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	The submitter questions the application of the Town Centre Zone to Paraparaumu beach, rather than Local Centre Zone as is applied to Raumati South and Waikanae Beach. PC(N) does not propose to change the centres hierarchy, or change the zoning of Metropolitan, Town and Local Centres zones that are part of the centres hierarchy. Rather, PC(N) gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD based on the Metropolitan, Town and Local Centre zones as they are in the operative District Plan. Therefore, I consider that it would not be appropriate to rezone the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone as Local Centre Zone, on the basis that this would be inconsistent with the District's centres hierarchy.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S018.02.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S019	S019.01	Moxon, Christopher	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S019.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S019.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged areas as they have been identified with potential of being affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 4 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S019	S019.02	Moxon, Christopher	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level rise and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S019.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S019.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S019	S019.03	Moxon, Christopher	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S019.01 and S019.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S019	S019.04	Moxon, Christopher	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S019.01 and S019.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S020	S020.01	Treadwell, Mical	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S020.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S020.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged areas as they have been identified with potential of being affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S020	S020.02	Treadwell, Mical	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level rise and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S020.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S020.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S020	S020.03	Treadwell, Mical	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S020.01 and S020.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S020	S020.04	Treadwell, Mical	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S020.01 and S020.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S209.FS.1	S020.04.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209. Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth. The proposed 'bakery' area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S020	S020.05	Treadwell, Mical	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S020.01 and S020.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S020	S020.06	Treadwell, Mical	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S020.01 and S020.02.	Alternatively, if submission S020.05 is not accepted, limit the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S020	S020.07	Treadwell, Mical	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S020.01 and S020.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S021	S021.01	Cunningham, Stephen	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S021.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S021.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged areas as they have been identified with potential of being affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S021	S021.02	Cunningham, Stephen	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S021.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S021.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S021	S021.03	Cunningham, Stephen	PRECx3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S021.01 and S021.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S021	S021.04	Cunningham, Stephen	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S021.01 and S021.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S209.FS.1	S021.04.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209. Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth. The proposed 'bakery' area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S021	S021.05	Cunningham, Stephen	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S021.01 and S021.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S021	S021.06	Cunningham, Stephen	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S021.01 and S021.02.	Alternatively, if submission S021.05 is not accepted, limit the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S021	S021.07	Cunningham, Stephen	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S021.01 and S021.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S022	S022.01	Amad, Linda	General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submission does not support high rises at Waikanae Beach, as they will change the look of the beach and have a very bad environmental effect.	<b>Do not allow</b> high rises at Waikanae Beach.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what the submitter considers to be a "high rise", however I note that at Waikanae Beach, PC2 generally allows: - 3-storey buildings to be developed within the General Residential Zone (as part of incorporating the Medium Density Residential Standards); and - 4-storey buildings to be developed within the Local Centre Zone, and within approximately 200m of the Local Centre Zone (as part of giving effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD).  The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S023	S023.01	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	Otaihanga (western side of Tieko Street)	Not specified	The submission relates to property in Otaihanga owned by the submitters, for which the submitters are currently seeking resource consent for subdivision (including earthworks and infrastructure).  The submission generally supports the growth principles, priorities and aspirations included in Te Tupu Pai – the district's growth strategy. In particular the submission supports the main elements of growth, and the emphasis of "opening up some greenfields progressively over time, with our greenfield development also being denser and more connected into public transport" (page 8 of Te Tupu Pai).  The submitters seek that their property is rezoned from Rural Lifestyle to General Residential Zone. The submitters believe that their property meets the criteria required for rezoning, and rezoning would meet the intent of Policies 3 and 4 of the NPS-UD.  The submitters believe that the subdivision (including earthworks and infrastructure) that they have sought resource consent for demonstrates a sufficient degree of investigation with respect to site constraints and infrastructure. In addition to this, regional consents have been granted (including in respect of wetlands), relevant iwi have confirmed their support and Heritage New Zealand have granted an archaeological authority for earthworks.  The proposed subdivision borders the western side of the northern part of Tieko Street, which is zoned General Residential. The proposed subdivision meets the high priority requirement for greenfield sites to be located adjoining existing urban areas.	<b>Rezone</b> the submitter's property in Otaihanga from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone (including any other amendments to PC2 required to achieve the outcomes sought in the submission).	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S235.FS.1	S023.01.FS01	Morris, Brent and Leanne	Otaihanga (western side of Tieko Street)	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission point. Rezoning requests would create residential pockets in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There needs to be more planning than just allowing pockets of housing. Concerns regarding light pollution, impact of birds, reverse sensitivity of rural activities, lack of infrastructure.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S023.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Otaihanga (western side of Tieko Street)	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S023.01.FS03	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Otaihanga (western side of Tieko Street)	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kapiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S023	S023.02	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	DO-03	Not specified	The submission generally supports the proposed amendments to clause 3 of the objective, however the objective retains a "maintain a consolidated urban form approach". This approach has contributed to the housing crisis and shortfall in homes. It does not reflect Te Tupu Pai or the assessments undertaken as part of the S32 report for proposed PC2. Nor does it provide for the enabling of urban development proposed by PPC1 to the Wellington RPS, the NPS-UD or the relevant provisions of the RMA.  Clause 6 of the Objective adopts an approach to amenity that also appears to be inconsistent with the direction in Policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> DO-03 to: - Change the narrow consolidation of existing urban areas approach to reflect the broader 'urban environment' approach included in the NPS-UD, PPC2 to the Wellington RPS, the intentions of Te Tupu Pai and the Urban Development Greenfield Assessment. - Amend Clause 6 in respect of the reference to amenity to bring it into line with NPSUD Policy 6.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that DO-03 has a narrow focus on existing urban areas. I consider that the amended wording of DO-03 seeks to balance achieving a consolidated urban form while acknowledging the need to provide for the development of new urban areas. I consider that this would generally be achieved where new urban areas are able to be efficiently serviced and integrated with existing urban areas (which is an outcome sought by the objective in relation to new urban areas).  In relation to clause 6, I do not consider this to be inconsistent with Policy 6 of the NPS-UD. Clause 6 is amended by PC2 to require management of development in a manner that <i>has regard</i> to character and amenity values. While Policy 6(b) provides that changes in an urban environment may detract from amenity values, and are not of themselves an adverse effect, it does not direct decision-makers to disregard changes to amenity values as a result of development.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S023.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-03	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S023.02.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-03	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support development. This needs to be addressed while recognising and providing for s6 RMA matters as addressed through our submission. Ensure that s6 matters are recognised and provided for through PC2	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S023	S023.03	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	DO-03, Definitions	Not specified	The terms 'urban areas' and 'urban environment' are not defined in the operative District Plan. Providing a definition of these key terms would assist to clarify the intent of the amendments to the Objective and other operative District Plan provisions.	<b>Add</b> definitions of 'urban areas' and 'urban environment' to the District Plan – the definition of 'urban areas' should be broader than just listing existing and identified future areas from the operative District Plan. The NPS-UD definition of 'urban environment' should be adopted.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that the term <i>existing urban area</i> is already defined in the operative District Plan.  I do not consider it necessary for the District Plan to include a definition of <i>urban environment</i> , as this is already defined under section 77F of the RMA and clause 1.4 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S023	S023.04	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	DO-011	Support	The submission generally supports the proposed amendments to objective DO-011.	<b>Retain</b> the amendments to Objective DO-011 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S023	S023.05	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	DO-011 (Explanatory Text)	Support in part	The submission generally supports the proposed amendments to the explanation of DO-011, but seek that the 'Otaihanga area' is referred to reflect the potential of the wider area beyond the existing Otaihanga residential area	<b>Amend</b> the explanation to Objective DO-011 to refer to the "Otaihanga area".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider the descriptions of the various locations included in the explanatory text to DO-011 to be general in nature. I do not consider it necessary to amend the text, as I consider it can be inferred from the general nature of the text that the description relates to the general Otaihanga area.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S023	S023.06	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	UFD-P1	Oppose	The submission generally opposes the proposed amendments as they reinforce the approach taken when the PDP was prepared prior to 2012. It does not reflect Te Tupu Pai or the assessments undertaken as part of the S32 report for proposed PC2. Nor does it provide for the enabling of urban development proposed by PPC1 to the Wellington RPS, the NPS-UD or the relevant provisions of the RMA.  The policy does not implement Objective DO-03 as sought to be amended.	<b>Amend</b> policy UFD-P1 to change the narrow consolidation of existing urban areas approach to reflect the broader 'urban environment' approach included in the NPS-UD, PPC2 to the Wellington RPS, the intentions of Te Tupu Pai and the Urban Development Greenfield Assessment. The relief sought to submission point S023.02 should be the basis for the amendments to this policy.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree with the submitter that there is some inconsistency between this policy and objective DO-03. Specifically, UFD-P1 does not adequately acknowledge that DO-03 seeks to provide for the development of new urban areas where these can be efficiently serviced and integrated with existing urban areas. As part of implementing objective DO-03, I consider it appropriate to amend UFD-P1 to provide for this outcome.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P1 (refer section 2.2 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better recognises that the development of new urban areas where these can be efficiently serviced and integrated with existing urban areas is an outcome sought by objective DO-03.
S100.FS.1	S023.06.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support development. This needs to be addressed while recognising and providing for s6 RMA matters as addressed through our submission. Ensure that s6 matters are recognised and provided for through PC2	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S023	S023.07	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	UFD-P3	Oppose	The submission generally opposes the proposed amendments to the policy as they do not properly implement policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD, or objective DO-011 (as proposed to be amended by PC2).	<b>Amend</b> policy UFD-P3 to reflect properly the intent of Policy 6 (b) of the NPS-UD when considering the changes planned urban form may have on amenity values, and the proposed amendments to Objective DO-011.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider UFD-P3 to be inconsistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD or Objective DO-011 of PC2.  UFD-P3 provides that residential intensification give consideration to effects on character and amenity values, where these are provided for in the District Plan. While Policy 6(b) provides that changes in an urban environment may detract from amenity values, and are not of themselves an adverse effect, it does not direct decision-makers to disregard changes to amenity values as a result of development. In any case, where consideration is given under policy UFD-P3, this would be undertaken by decision-makers in the manner directed by Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S023	S023.08	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	UFD-P4	Support in part	While the submission generally supports the amendments to introduce the intensification provisions, the policy does not reflect Te Tupu Pai or the assessments undertaken as part of the S32 report for proposed PC2. Nor does it provide for the enabling of urban development proposed by PPC1 to the Wellington RPS, the NPS-UD or the relevant provisions of the RMA.  The policy does not implement Objective DO-03 as sought to be amended.	<b>Amend</b> policy UFD-P4 to reflect the broader 'urban environment' approach included in the NPS-UD, PPC1 to the Wellington RPS, the intentions of Te Tupu Pai and the Urban Development Greenfield Assessment. The relief sought to submission point S023.02 should be the basis for the amendments to this policy.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider the amendments to UFD-P4 to be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, PC1 to the RPS or Te Tupu Pai. In relation to Appendix N to the Section 32 Evaluation Report (the Urban Development Greenfield Assessment), I consider this to be a technical assessment that provides supporting information only. It is not an RMA planning document, or a plan or strategy prepared under another Act.  Refer to pages 2 and 3 of Appendix C to the Section 32 Evaluation Report for an explanation of how the amendments to UFD-P4 give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S023	S023.09	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	UFD-P11	Support in part	The submission generally supports the proposed amendments, but suggest that they do not properly implement policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD, or objective DO-011 (as proposed to be amended by PC2).	<b>Amend</b> policy UFD-P11 to reflect properly the intent of Policy 6 (b) of the NPS-UD when considering the changes planned urban form may have on amenity values, and the proposed amendments to Objective DO-011.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider UFD-P3 to be inconsistent with Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD or Objective DO-011 of PC2, for the reasons stated in my assessment under submission point S023.07.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S024	S024.01	W North Limited	Land off Waipunahau Road, Waikanae (Waikanae Development Area)	Not specified	<p>The submission relates to a part of the Waikanae North Development Area. The submission opposes the retention of the existing Waikanae North Structure Plan and opposes the failure to rezone the land as part of the General Residential Zone and as part Residential Intensification Precinct.</p> <p>The submission identifies that the land meets the criteria set for rezoning in the Section 32 report and the existing structure plan provisions are no longer working for the WNDA as a result of previous land tenure changes and development within the area.</p> <p>The land is more suitable for rezoning to General Residential than many of the other areas identified for rezoning in the notified version of PC2. Supporting documents in the Section 32 report confirm that the WNDA is "zoned for residential development" and is therefore suitable for rezoning and application of the MDRS. Given the underlying intent for higher density development in the part of the WNDA currently within Precincts 45 and 46 (Multi-Unit Residential and Mixed Use Precincts) it is also appropriate to include that part of the WNDA in the Residential Intensification Precinct area.</p> <p>There is potential to use the consented subdivision scheme plan for part of the land as a zoning outline should KCDC see the need to protect areas to be vested as reserve as Open Space Zone.</p> <p>The submission also includes an analysis that identifies that the Waikanae North Development Area meets the criteria set for rezoning in the Section 32 report, as well as a further analysis that concludes that the land is more suitable for rezoning to General Residential than many of the other areas identified for rezoning in the notified version of PC2.</p>	<b>Rezone</b> 38.1ha of land off Waipunahau Road, Waikanae from Waikanae North Development Area to General Residential Zone, with the parts currently identified as Precincts 45 and 46 (Multi Unit Residential and Mixed Use Precincts) rezoned as Residential Intensification Precinct.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S024.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Land off Waipunahau Road, Waikanae (Waikanae Development Area)	Support primary submission	<p>Support this submission.</p> <p>SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first - to allow for much greater housing intensification - the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents - make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built) - reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station - when the railway line is further electrified to Otaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access - this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S024.01.FS02	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Land off Waipunahau Road, Waikanae (Waikanae Development Area)	Support primary submission	<p>Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal.</p> <p>Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast.</p> <p>KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.</p> <p>Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.</p>	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S025	S025.01	Grant, John	FC-R5, FC-R6, FC-Table x2	Not specified	It is unclear how financial contributions for infrastructure will be ascertained. There is a possibility of pockets of medium to high density housing relying on access to existing infrastructure never designed to cater for this eventuality.	<b>Confirmation</b> that developers will pay for any upgrade to any component of Council facilities required to service the development.	4.17 Financial Contributions	I consider that the rules FC-R5, FC-R6 and table FC-Table x2 enable financial contributions for the purposes of upgrading water supply systems, stormwater disposal services, wastewater disposal services and transport infrastructure to meet the additional demand generated by the development.	<b>No recommendation.</b> No decision requested.	<b>No.</b>
S025	S025.02	Grant, John	Flood hazard areas	Not specified	The Council already has infrastructure at risk of flood hazard.	<b>Confirmation</b> that no development under this new regime will be approved in any area that possible flooding may render the use of the land impractical.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S026	S026.01	The Loyalty Initiative	18 Huiawa Street, Waikanae Beach	Support	<p>The submission supports the proposed rezoning of 18 Huiawa Street.</p> <p>The submission includes a detailed analysis of how the site meets the criteria for identifying land for rezoning as General Residential Land, as described in paragraph 5.2.3 of the S32 report.</p> <p>The submission identifies that development of the site will achieve compliance with the Council's LDMR document.</p> <p>The submission also includes an attached memo on the ownership history of the site. The memo "explores the historic tenure of the land to ascertain whether the land was gifted or not and if in fact there are any obligations associated with that, if that were the case". The memo concludes by stating that "most of the land within the subject title 5227m2 (title reference 19267) was not gifted and the 525m2 identified as part of the old stream bed is of no consequence i.e. does not carry any obligation pertaining a purported gifting of the land as the titles are silent to this matter".</p>	<b>Approve</b> the proposed rezoning of 18 Huiawa Street to General Residential Zone PREC2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S158.FS.1	S026.01.FS01	Thom, Elizabeth	19 Huiawa Street, Waikanae Beach	Oppose primary submission	<p>The primary submission incorrectly interprets the extent and significance of the flood hazard zone on this site and therefore the ability to develop.</p> <p>The submission is incorrect in relation to the purpose of qualifying matters, these are not to be resolved in accordance with KCDC's Land Development Minimum requirements or other matters that KCDC has reserved control over.</p> <p>The subdivision rules currently have the correct purpose of limiting development to what was intended under the MDRS. In particular, the application of permitted activity baseline tests.</p> <p>18 Huiawa Street is not available for inclusion in PC2 for rezoning as there are unanswered jurisdiction issues and the flood hazard issue that have not been resolved.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S026	S026.02	The Loyalty Initiative	GRZ-Px2	Not specified	The legislation allows Councils to preclude medium density development where there are relevant qualifying matters. However, the current wording of the Policy GRZ-Px2 does not provide sufficient certainty around what is considered 'relevant' and how those relevant matters are applied to preclude development.	<b>Amend</b> policy GRZ-Px2 to make it clear that a qualifying matter will only be a limiting factor for consideration of resource consent applications, where that qualifying matter has not been resolved in accordance with Council's Land Development Minimum requirements or other matter that Council has reserved control over.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S026	S026.03	The Loyalty Initiative	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	It is anticipated that applications for both land use and subdivision will be lodged concurrently it is not clear under the controlled activity subdivision rule that subdivisions applied for in this manner will be assessed as a controlled activity. This should be provided for.	<b>Amend</b> subdivision rule SUB-RES-Rx1.2.b in the Residential Zone to allow for a land use consent for a comprehensive residential development on individual allotments where the development complies with the MDRS; and the associated subdivision to be considered concurrently (under rule SUB-RES-Rx1) with the land use consent application. Currently the wording of Subdivision Rule SUB-RES-Rx1.2.b requires the parent allotment to demonstrate compliance with the relevant MDRS rules; or for an approved land use consent to be in place.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider that the provision as drafted already achieves the outcome sought by the submitter. Where a land use and subdivision consent is bundled together (and therefore considered together), the concurrent granting of the land use consent with the subdivision consent provides for standards 1(b) or 2(b) under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to be met (and therefore the activity to be concurrently assessed as a controlled activity under SUB-RES-Rx1).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S026	S026.04	The Loyalty Initiative	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	Subdivisions being assessed under this rule must also show that there is no increase in non-compliance with the MDRS provisions; or that a land use consent is already in place. Therefore, there is no reason why limited notification should not be precluded in these instances.	<b>Amend</b> the restricted discretionary activity subdivision rule SUB-RES-R27 in the Residential Zone to provide for subdivision of land which is not a controlled activity under SUB-RES-Rx1 where it does not meet one or more of the standards under Rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to exclude the requirement for the written approval of person; and exclude the requirement for serving notice on any person.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S094.FS.1	S026.04.FS01	KiwiRail	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose primary submission	KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for high density developments that do not comply with the prescribed setback standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S027	S027.01	Ryan, Rachel	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Oppose	There is considerable flooding in this area, which intensification will likely exacerbate.  There is uncertainty as to the need for intensification in the short to medium term.  Making changes to intensification on an incremental, least regrets, basis like this will allow the council to respond over time to the changing character of its urban centres as intensification takes place and to address infrastructure and other challenges of place based development before they occur.  This approach would be similar to other Councils (for example the Wellington City Council), which have reduced intensification areas.	<b>Amend</b> the boundary of Residential Intensification Precinct A to the south-west of Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Zone so that it ends at Ihakara Street.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S027	S027.02	Ryan, Rachel	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Not specified	Full public notification should be required for consents for taller structures where more severe environmental effects are likely, including drainage.	<b>Require</b> fully notified resource consents for buildings higher than 3 storeys in the Ihakara to Raumati Road area.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that the provisions of the Residential Intensification Precinct can be amended to require notification of consents for buildings that breach height standards. Under clause 5 of Schedule 3A, public notification of applications for resource consents for buildings that breach height standards must be precluded in the General Residential Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S027.02.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S027.02.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.01	Infill Tapui Limited	DO-O3, DO-O11	Support	Paragraphs 1 to 5 outline the overall position of the submission. The submission fundamentally supports the IPI but requests some specific amendments to better implement the NPS-UD.  These amendments are also consistent with international and national policy direction that seeks to achieve SDG 11 by making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.  It is imperative that the District Plan enables high density development across the urban area to reduce the demand for car dependent suburban sprawl and the associated environmental degradation that accompanies it.	<b>Retain</b> amendments to DO-O3 and DO-O11 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to these provisions in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S028.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O3, DO-O11	Support primary submission	Agree with some of the sentiment but prefer the NHoO proposal to pause the intensification for Ōtaki to enable appropriate planning and infrastructure development to achieve 'te tupu pai'	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.02	Infill Tapui Limited	DO-Ox1, DO-Ox2	Support	See general points under submission point S028.01.	<b>Retain</b> DO-Ox1 and DO-Ox2 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.03	Infill Tapui Limited	DO-Ox3, DO-O16	Oppose	References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 4-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six storeys' to be consistent with the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> DO-Ox3 and DO-O16 to replace references to "buildings up to 6-storeys" and "buildings up to 4-storeys" with "buildings of at least six storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that DO-Ox3 and DO-O16 are consistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.  The requirement under Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD to "enable... buildings of at least 6-storeys" means that the District Plan must enable 6-storey buildings, or alternatively may enable buildings that are taller than 6-storeys. I consider that because DO-Ox3 and DO-O16 enable buildings that are 6-storeys, this achieves the requirement under Policy 3(c) that the District Plan must enable buildings of at least 6 storeys.  Further, I consider that replacing the term "up to" with "at least" would provide no certainty to District Plan users about the building heights sought to be enabled by the Plan, as it would have the effect of enabling unlimited building height. Further, I consider it would have the effect of dis-abling buildings that are less than the specified height, because those buildings would not be "at least" that height. This may be counterproductive in terms of achieving the housing variety sought by the MDRS and the NPS-UD.  In relation to the parts of DO-Ox3 and DO-O16 that enable "buildings up to 4 storeys", these relate to the building heights enabled by PC2 in the Local Centre Zone and Residential Intensification Precinct B which give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. I do not consider that it is necessary to amend the objectives to enable "buildings of at least six storeys" in these areas, as I do not consider this necessary as part of giving effect to policy 3(d).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.03.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	DO-Ox3, DO-O16	Support primary submission	Support change of wording to refer to buildings of at least six storeys as requested by submitter. Aligns with the intent of our primary submission and NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.03.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-Ox3, DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.03.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-Ox3, DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Not clear evidence of need in Ōtaki. Out of step with TOW claims process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S028	S028.04	Infill Tapui Limited	UFD-Px	Oppose	See general points under submission point S028.01.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-Px to replace references to "buildings up to 6-storeys" and "buildings up to 4-storeys" with "buildings of at least six storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to the assessment under S028.04.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.04.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	UFD-Px	Support primary submission	Support change of wording to refer to buildings of at least six stories as requested by submitter. Aligns with the intent of our primary submission and NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.04.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.04.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Not clear evidence of need in Otaki. Out of step with TOW claims process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.05	Infill Tapui Limited	UFD-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P3, UFD-P4, UFD-P11	Support	See general points under submission point S028.01.	<b>Retain</b> amendments to UFD-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P3, UFD-P4 and UFD-P11 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to these provisions in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.06	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px2, GRZ-Px3, GRZ-Px4, GRZ-Px5	Support	See general points under submission point S028.01.	<b>Retain</b> GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px2, GRZ-Px3, GRZ-Px4 and GRZ-Px5 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.07	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Px6	Oppose	See submission point S028.03.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Px6 to replace references to "buildings up to 6-storeys" and "buildings up to 4-storeys" with "buildings of at least six storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to the assessment under S028.04.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.07.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Px6	Support primary submission	Support change of wording to refer to buildings of at least six stories as requested by submitter. Aligns with the intent of our primary submission and NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.07.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	GRZ-Px6	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Not clear evidence of need in Otaki. Out of step with TOW claims process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.08	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose	There should be no limit on the number of residential units per site in the Residential Intensification Precinct.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx2 so that there is no limit on the number of residential units per site in the Residential Intensification Precinct.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that it is appropriate to provide a permitted activity standard for the number of residential units per site in Residential Intensification Precincts, as this enables the effects associated with higher density development to be assessed through a restricted discretionary activity resource consent process (and provides for the development to be considered alongside the Residential Design Guide). I consider this approach to be consistent with both policies GRZ-Rx5 and GRZ-Rx6.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.08.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Rx2	Support primary submission	Support submitters intent that number of residential units per site should not be the same as medium density provisions. Support the intent of this submission and request that the Council consider allowing for more than 3 residential units per site as a permitted activity so that it supports a greater permitted baseline to that of the General Residential Zone (MDRS provisions).	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.09	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose	Applying the height in relation to boundary and setback standards within the Residential Intensification Precinct will result in perverse outcomes. For example: a. The current height in relation boundary standard would require a six storey building to have a front yard that is over 20 metres. Excessive front yards are an inefficient use of land and do not provide a good street frontage. b. The current boundary setback standards will lead to 2m 'gaps' between buildings on adjacent properties. Such gaps are an inefficient use of land and do not provide any usable outdoor space, sunlight, or privacy.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx2 so that the following setbacks apply: a. Up to four stories: 6m between non-habitable rooms, 9m between habitable rooms and non-habitable rooms, 12m between habitable rooms; b. Between five and eight storeys: 13m between habitable rooms and non habitable rooms, 18m between habitable rooms; c. Nine stories and more: 12m between non-habitable rooms, 18m between habitable rooms and non-habitable rooms, 24m between habitable rooms.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendments sought are inconsistent with the setback standard required by the MDRS, and may be difficult to implement in practice (in part because it may be difficult to determine the location and extent of habitable and non-habitable rooms in adjacent buildings). I also consider this to be an "other density standard" restricted under clause 2(2) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.  I disagree that the height in relation to boundary standard requires a 6-storey building to have a 20m front yard, because the standard does not apply to the road boundary.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.09.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Rx2	Support primary submission	Support submitters concern regarding recession plane requirements for six storey buildings if this is going to result in excessive front yard requirements. Support the reasons behind this submission and that recession planes for taller buildings need to be modelled/fact checked so that excessive front yards are not established as an outcome as this is not a good use of space.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.09.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.09.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Not clear evidence of need in Otaki. Out of step with TOW claims process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.10	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose	Four stories are only one storey above the MDRS and the cost to build four storeys over three storeys is potentially significant because the following additional building code requirements apply: a. Lifts are required. b. Fire resistance ratings apply. c. A wind report and fire engineer are needed. d. Specific engineering design for light timber framing is required. e. Structural steel framing is possibly required. f. Cross laminated timber is recommended.  Six storeys (approximately 18 metres) are the minimum building height required to be enabled by Policy 3(b) and (c) in the NPS-UD but the building code requirements remain similar up to seven storeys (21 metres).	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx2 (standard 2) so that the maximum permitted height in Residential Intensification Precincts is 21 metres (7 storeys).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to Residential Intensification Precinct A (which gives effect to Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD) it is not clear to me why it is necessary to enable 7-storey development. In any case, the height provided for by PC2 is 20m, which is similar to that sought by the submitter.  In relation to Residential Intensification Precinct A (which gives effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD), which I acknowledge that there tends to be greater technical requirements for the design and construction of buildings taller than 3-storeys. I do not consider that this in and of itself justifies an increase in building heights as part of giving effect to Policy 3(d).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.10.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Rx2	Support primary submission	Support the intent of this submission that four stories should be amended to allow for at least six stories as per the relief sought in primary submission. Submitters reasons align with the relief sought and intent of primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.10.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose primary submission	No evidence of need in this area. Allows for perverse outcomes	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.11	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Rx5	Support	See general points under submission point S028.01.	<b>Retain</b> GRZ-Rx5 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S028	S028.12	Infill Tapui Limited	GRZ-Rx6, GRZ-Rx7	Oppose	Allowing density to trigger a notification assessment is inconsistent with Objectives DO-03 and DO-Ox3 as well as policies GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px5 and amended UFD-P4.	<b>Combine</b> GRZ-Rx6 and GRZ-Rx7 into one rule as follows: <b>New buildings and structures, and any minor works, additions or alterations to any building or structure, that will result in more than 3 residential units per site.</b>  Public and limited notification would be precluded under this rule.  Matters of discretion would remain unchanged.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree that the use of multiple rules to distinguish notification requirements is unnecessarily complicated, and I consider the amendment requested by the submitter would provide for more efficient implementation of the rules.  My recommended amendments adopt different wording to that requested by the submitter, which adopt wording that is consistent with rule GRZ-Rx5. I consider this has the same effect as requested by the submitter.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting that I have recommended different wording to that requested by the submitter (but with the same effect).	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-Rx6 (refer section 4.29 of PC(R1)). Delete GRZ-Rx7 (refer section 4.30 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider these amendments are a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because they provide for more efficient implementation of the restricted discretionary activity rules associated with the MDRS. The amendments are consistent with the requirements of clauses 4 and 5 of Schedule 3A to the RMA.
S094.FS.1	S028.12.FS01	KiwiRail	GRZ-Rx6, GRZ-Rx7	Oppose primary submission	KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for high density developments that do not comply with the prescribed setback standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.12.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx6, GRZ-Rx7	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.12.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Rx6, GRZ-Rx7	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.13	Infill Tapui Limited	MCZ-P8	Oppose	References of 'buildings up to 12-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least twelve stories'.	<b>Amend</b> policy MCZ-P8 to replace references to "buildings up to 12-storeys" with "buildings of at least twelve storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be appropriate, because PC2 does not seek to enable buildings taller than 12-storeys in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S028.13.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.13.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Not clear evidence of need in Otaki. Out of step with TOW claims process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.14	Infill Tapui Limited	MCZ-R5	Oppose	Residential units should be required to have a minimum size. This should be 30m <sup>2</sup> for studios and 45m <sup>2</sup> for one or more bedrooms.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-R5 (standard 2) to require a minimum residential unit size of 30m <sup>2</sup> for studios and 45m <sup>2</sup> for units with one or more bedrooms.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider there to be sufficient justification for the District Plan to regulate the minimum size of residential units in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and I do not consider this necessary to give effect to Policy 3(b) of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.15	Infill Tapui Limited	MCZ-R7	Oppose	The maximum permitted building height should be 36m (approximately 12 stories). This is consistent with Policy MCZ-P8.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-R7 (standard 1) so that the maximum permitted building height is 36m (approximately 12 storeys).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that Policy MCZ-P8 requires 12-storey buildings to be a permitted activity. I note that 12-storey buildings are enabled as a restricted discretionary activity under rule MCZ-R13. I consider the 21m (6-storey) permitted building height standard is an appropriate threshold to enable the effects associated with higher density development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to be assessed through a restricted discretionary activity resource consent process (and provides for the development to be considered alongside the Centres Design Guide).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.16	Infill Tapui Limited	MCZ-R7	Oppose	Standard 2 should be removed. It unreasonably restricts development at the edge of the zone and is therefore inconsistent with the NPS-UD. The building setbacks recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-R7 (standard 2) to remove the height in relation to boundary standard and replace it with the setbacks specified under submission point S028.09.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I disagree that applying the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard is either unreasonably restrictive, or inconsistent with the NPS-UD. The standard only applies to the Metropolitan Centre Zone edge, and I consider it reasonable that the standard is used to manage adverse effects across the boundary with more sensitive zones.  I note that non-compliance with the standard is a restricted discretionary activity under rule MCZ-R13, which provides a consent pathway where development breaches the standard. I do not consider this to be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, which (under clause 3.4) considers development to be plan-enabled where it is a restricted-discretionary activity.  I also consider the alternative standard requested to be difficult to implement in practice (refer to my assessment under S028.09).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.17	Infill Tapui Limited	MCZ-R13	Oppose	Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> rule MCZ-R13 to preclude public and limited notification.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires notification to be precluded in the centres zones. However, I consider that it is reasonable to preclude public notification from non-compliance with standards for height in relation to boundary, setback from the zone edge, outdoor living space and outlook space. I discuss this in further detail in response to the Kāinga Ora submission on this matter (refer to submission point S122.150).	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to submission point S122.150.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend MCZ-R13 (refer section 5.8 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to submission point S122.150.
S100.FS.1	S028.17.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.17.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.18	Infill Tapui Limited	MCZ-R13	Oppose	Buildings over 36m in height (approximately 12 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.	<b>Delete</b> standard 2 from Rule MCZ-R13.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I disagree that buildings taller than 12-storeys should be a restricted discretionary activity, because they are not sought to be enabled in the zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.19	Infill Tapui Limited	TCZ-P6	Oppose	References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.	<b>Amend</b> policy TCZ-P6 to replace references to "buildings up to 6-storeys" with "buildings of at least six storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be appropriate, because PC2 does not seek to enable buildings taller than 6-storeys in the Town Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.19.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	TCZ-P6	Support primary submission	Support change of wording to refer to buildings of at least six stories as requested by submitter. Aligns with the intent of our primary submission and NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S028.19.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	No evidence of need in this area. Allows for perverse outcomes	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.20	Infill Tapui Limited	TCZ-R6	Oppose	The maximum permitted building height should be 21m (approximately 7 stories). This is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Amend TCZ-R6 (standard 1) so that the maximum permitted building height is 21m (approximately 7 storeys).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD requires buildings 21m in height to be a permitted activity in the Town Centre Zone, however I note that buildings 21m in height are enabled as a restricted discretionary activity under rule TCZ-R11. I consider the 12m (3-storey) permitted building height standard is an appropriate threshold to enable the effects associated with higher density development in the Town Centre Zone to be assessed through a restricted discretionary activity resource consent process (and provides for the development to be considered alongside the Centres Design Guide). I consider this to be consistent with proposed policy TCZ-P6.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.21	Infill Tapui Limited	TCZ-R6	Oppose	The building setbacks recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.	Amend TCZ-R6 (standard 2) to remove the height in relation to boundary standard and replace it with the setbacks specified under submission point S028.09.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to the assessment under S028.16.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.22	Infill Tapui Limited	TCZ-R11	Oppose	Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Amend rule TCZ-R11 to preclude public and limited notification.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires notification to be precluded in the centres zones. However, I consider that it is reasonable to preclude public notification from non-compliance with standards for height in relation to boundary, setback from the zone edge, outdoor living space and outlook space. I discuss this in further detail in response to the Kāinga Ora submission on this matter (refer to submission point S122.137).	Accept in part. Refer to submission point S122.137.	Yes. Amend TCZ-R11 (refer section 6.11 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to submission point S122.137.
S197.FS.1	S028.22.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-R11	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission, as it is consistent with the NPSUD.	Allow primary submission subject to the relief sought in the RVA primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S028.22.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	TCZ-R11	Support primary submission	Ryman support the relief sought subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission, as it is consistent with the NPSUD.	Allow primary submission subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.22.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.22.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.23	Infill Tapui Limited	TCZ-R11	Oppose	Buildings over 21m in height (approximately 7 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.	Delete standard 2 from Rule TCZ-R11.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I disagree that buildings over 21m in height should be a restricted discretionary activity, because they are not sought to be enabled in the zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.24	Infill Tapui Limited	LCZ-P6	Oppose	References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.	Amend policy LCZ-P6 to replace references to "buildings up to 6-storeys" with "buildings of at least six storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be appropriate, because PC2 does not seek to enable buildings taller than 6-storeys in the Local Centre Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S202.FS.1	S028.24.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	LCZ-P6	Support primary submission	Support change of wording to refer to buildings of at least six stories as requested by submitter. Aligns with the intent of our primary submission and NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.24.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	Undermines individual choice and significantly changes character and amenity. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.24.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	No evidence of need in this area. Allows for perverse outcomes	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.25	Infill Tapui Limited	LCZ-R6	Oppose	The maximum permitted building height should be 21m (approximately 7 stories).	Amend LCZ-R6 (standard 1) so that the maximum permitted building height is 21m (approximately 7 storeys).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that providing buildings 21m in height in the Local Centre Zone as a permitted activity is justified, nor do I consider that this is necessary to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. I consider the 12m (3-storey) permitted building height standard is an appropriate threshold to enable the effects associated with higher density development in the Local Centre Zone to be assessed through a restricted discretionary activity resource consent process (and provides for the development to be considered alongside the Centres Design Guide). I consider this to be consistent with proposed policy LCZ-P6.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.26	Infill Tapui Limited	LCZ-R6	Oppose	The building setbacks recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.	Amend LCZ-R6 (standard 2) to remove the height in relation to boundary standard and replace it with the setbacks specified under submission point S028.09.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to the assessment under S028.16.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.27	Infill Tapui Limited	LCZ-R12	Oppose	Public and limited notification should be precluded. Allowing height to trigger notification is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Amend rule LCZ-R12 to preclude public and limited notification.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires notification to be precluded in the centres zones. However, I consider that it is reasonable to preclude public notification from non-compliance with standards for height in relation to boundary, setback from the zone edge, outdoor living space and outlook space. I discuss this in further detail in response to the Kāinga Ora submission on this matter (refer to submission point S122.116).	Accept in part. Refer to submission point S122.116.	Yes. Amend LCZ-R12 (refer section 6.11 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to submission point S122.116.
S100.FS.1	S028.27.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.27.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.28	Infill Tapui Limited	LCZ-R12	Oppose	Buildings over 21m in height (approximately 7 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.	Delete standards 2 and 3 from Rule LCZ-R12.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I disagree that buildings over 21m in height should be a restricted discretionary activity, because they are not sought to be enabled in the zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.29	Infill Tapui Limited	MUZ-P7	Oppose	References of 'buildings up to 6-storeys' and 'buildings up to 3-storeys' should be replaced with 'buildings of at least six stories'.	Amend policy MUZ-P7 to replace references to "buildings up to 6-storeys" with "buildings of at least six storeys".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be appropriate, because PC2 does not seek to enable buildings taller than 6-storeys in the Mixed Use Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S028.29.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-P7	Oppose primary submission	No evidence of need in this area. Allows for perverse outcomes	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S028	S028.30	Infill Tapui Limited	MUZ-R6, MUZ-R9	Oppose	The Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct should not be excluded from this rule. With the impending revocation of former State Highway 1 this area is no longer a 'gateway' to Paraparaumu and is business land under the NPS-UD. This is consistent with Objective 3 and Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> rule MUZ-R6 to include Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct under the rule. <b>Delete</b> rule MUZ-R9 as a consequential amendment.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Policy 3 of the NPS-UD does not apply to the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct because it is not part of or adjacent to a centre zone where Policy 3(d) would apply, and it is not located within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone or a rapid transit stop where Policy 3(c) would apply. I do not consider Policy 2 to be relevant in this circumstance, because the purpose of PC2 is to give effect to Policy 3 (not Policy 2).  On this basis, I do not consider it appropriate to amend the provisions related to the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.31	Infill Tapui Limited	MUZ-R6	Oppose	The maximum permitted building height should be 21m (approximately 7 stories).	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R6 (standard 1) so that the maximum permitted building height is 21m (approximately 7 storeys).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that Policy 3 of the NPS-UD is only relevant to the Ihakara Street West, Ihakara Street East and Kāpiti Road precincts of the Mixed Use Zone, because these precincts are the only parts of the zone that are located within a walkable catchment of a rapid transit stop or the Metropolitan Centre Zone (they are located adjacent to the Metropolitan Centre Zone).  I do not consider that Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD requires buildings 21m in height to be a permitted activity in the Mixed Use Zone. I consider the 12m (3-storey) permitted building height standard is an appropriate threshold to enable the effects associated with higher density development in the Mixed Use Zone to be assessed through a restricted discretionary activity resource consent process (and provides for the development to be considered alongside the Centres Design Guide). I consider this to be consistent with proposed policy MUZ-P7.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.32	Infill Tapui Limited	MUZ-R6	Oppose	The building setbacks recommended for Rule GRZ-Rx2 should be used to maintain amenity values.	Amend MUZ-R6 (standard 2) to remove the height in relation to boundary standard and replace it with the setbacks specified under submission point S028.09.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to the assessment under S028.16.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.33	Infill Tapui Limited	MUZ-R11	Oppose	This rule should be removed. This is consistent with Objective 3 and Policy 2 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Delete</b> rule MUZ-R11.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Rule MUZ-R11 relates to retail activities in the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct. Refer to my assessment of S016.30 on this matter.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.34	Infill Tapui Limited	MUZ-R13	Oppose	Buildings over 21m in height (approximately 7 stories) should be a restricted discretionary activity.	<b>Delete</b> standard 1 Rule MUZ-R13.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I disagree that buildings over 21m in height should be a restricted discretionary activity, because they are not sought to be enabled in the zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.35	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-DW-Rx1	Not specified	This rule should not be dependent on compliance with standards for Rule SUB-RES-Rx1 but apply to all urban subdivision.	<b>Amend</b> rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to apply to all urban subdivision (not just subdivision under SUB-RES-Rx1).	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I have assumed that the decision requested is to amend SUB-DW-Rx1 (and not SUB-RES-Rx1). I disagree that SUB-DW-Rx1 should apply to all urban subdivision. SUB-DW-Rx1 is a controlled activity version of the operative restricted discretionary activity rule SUB-DW-R5 (which applies to subdivision in urban areas that are not subject to the MDRS). SUB-DW-Rx1 applies to subdivision in the General Residential Zone where the MDRS apply, and is required in order to comply with clause 3 of Schedule 3A to the RMA (which requires that MDRS subdivision is a controlled activity). There is no such requirement in relation to other urban areas, and as such I consider that subdivision in urban areas where the MDRS do not apply is appropriately provided for under the operative rule SUB-DW-R5.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.4	S028.35.FS01	Landlink	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support the rationale provided in this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.36	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose	Enhancing existing waterways and stormwater detention areas with plantings to create attractive features as part of managing stormwater for a subdivision is unreasonable. The esplanade provisions address this matter.	<b>Amend</b> standard 2 under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to remove reference to enhancing existing waterways and stormwater detention areas with plantings to create attractive features.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Based on the submission, I have assumed that the decision requested is to amend SUB-DW-Rx1 (and not SUB-RES-Rx1).  I agree with the submitter that the second part of the standard is vague, and that it would be difficult for applicants to determine whether or not they have complied with the standard. In any case, I consider this matter is already addressed by matters of control 3 and 8 under SUB-RES-Rx1 (through matter of control 1 under SUB-DW-Rx1).  I also consider it appropriate to replace the term "waterway" with "waterbody", as this is a defined term that is used elsewhere in the District Plan (including under NH-FLOOD-R2, which provides for setbacks from waterbodies, and SUB-DW-Table 1, which provides for esplanade reserves and strips).	Accept.	Yes. Amend SUB-DW-Rx1. Refer section 10.1 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more efficient interpretation and application of standard 2, while continuing to provide for the consideration of the planting in relation to waterbodies under matter of control 1 (which refers to matters of control 3 and 8 under SUB-RES-Rx1).
S206.FS.4	S028.36.FS01	Landlink	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Note that definitions of 'existing water way' and 'contributing catchment area' is important for clarity. Support for planting in principle, however believe that the standard could be reworded. E.g. 'as appropriate to the surrounding context'.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.36.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Water is a taonga and should be treated in a way that recognises and provides for this value and Te Mana o te Wai. Amend standard 2 under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to reference enhancing existing waterways and stormwater detention areas with plantings to create attractive features enhance amenity values.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.36.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	He taonga te wai - Water is a taonga and should be treated in a way that recognises and provides for this value and Te Mana o te Wai.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.37	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose	This should be broadened to include control over Low Impact Design and Integrated Catchment Management, not just swales.	<b>Amend</b> matter of control 3 under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to include control over Low Impact Design and Integrated Catchment Management, not just swales.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider that the scope of "low impact design and integrated catchment management" is unclear. While this could be made more specific by reference to the Council's Low Impact Urban Design and Development Stormwater Guideline (2012), this would incorporate a document by reference into the matter of control, and I consider it inappropriate to do this through a submission on the basis that the requirements for incorporating documents by reference outlined under clause 34 of Schedule 1 to the RMA would not have been met.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.4	S028.37.FS01	Landlink	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	Agree with comment on matters of control 3, however there is need to be more specific about what stormwater infrastructure is included (in addition to swales). Perhaps reference to KCDC's Low Impact Urban Design and Development (LIUDD) Stormwater Guideline (2012) is appropriate. This document include Detention tanks, soak pits, swales, filter strips, rain gardens, ponds, wetlands, treatment trenches/rock filters, permeable and porous pavement.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S028.37.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.37.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.38	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose	Public and limited notification should be precluded because this rule relates only to the provision of infrastructure for a subdivision.	Amend rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to preclude public and limited notification.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Both rules SUB-DW-Rx1 and SUB-RES-Rx1 already preclude public and limited notification, in accordance with clause 5(3) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S028.38.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.38.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.39	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-DW-R23	Oppose	Infrastructure is always required for subdivision and there is no justification for this being a non-complying activity because: a. Subdivision infrastructure is anticipated within the policy framework and should not need to pass the 'gateway tests' of s104D. b. There are minimum engineering requirements for infrastructure. c. Subdivision infrastructure is not an unexpected activity in the urban environment that requires a precautionary approach to managing effects.  A discretionary activity is more appropriate.	Amend rule SUB-DW-R23 to be a discretionary activity.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	SUB-DW-R23 is the non-complying activity rule for subdivision where standards requiring the provision of water, wastewater, stormwater, or electricity and telecommunication infrastructure are not met. For the avoidance of doubt, I consider that SUB-DW-R23 is triggered when infrastructure is not provided to subdivided allotments (whereas servicing and engineering standards for the provision of infrastructure are addressed under the rules of the Infrastructure Chapter).  I agree that the provision of development infrastructure is a necessary part of subdivision, and I note the District Plan includes several policies that require the provision of (or appropriate connection to) infrastructure as part of subdivision, use and development (see policies INF-MENU-P17 - P21).  Because the District Plan sets clear expectations that development infrastructure is required to be provided as part of undertaking subdivision, I consider that non-complying activity status is appropriate and that amending the activity status to discretionary is not justified.	Do not accept.	No.
S202.FS.1	S028.39.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-DW-R23	Support primary submission	Support the intent of this submission and the relief sought as it aligns with primary submission regarding the use of 'non-complying' activity statuses.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.4	S028.39.FS02	Landlink	SUB-DW-R23	Support primary submission	Support rationale - the effects of non-compliance with controlled infrastructure activity should not result in an application being subject to notification. Support rationale rules as proposed may result in an unnecessarily restrictive activity status. General advice (Quality Planning) outlines that 'the non-complying activity status is intended for situations where it is intended consents only be granted in exceptional circumstances'. As per elsewhere in Landlink submission minimum/prescriptive requirements may also stifle innovation and the utilisation of new technology which provide other viable solutions.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.40	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-DW-R23	Oppose	Public and limited notification should be precluded because this rule relates only to the provision of infrastructure for a subdivision.	Amend rule SUB-DW-R23 to preclude public and limited notification.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	disagree that public and limited notification should be precluded under this rule, as not meeting standards for the provision of infrastructure under SUB-DW-Rx1, SUB-DW-R4 and SUB-DW-R5 may have adverse effects beyond the site, including on surrounding properties and the community at large.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S028.40.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-DW-R23	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.40.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-R23	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.41	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-P1	Oppose	This policy is opposed. It is not appropriate for a policy to refer to other (undefined) objectives and policies.	Delete policy SUB-RES-P1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I agree that the policy is not necessary. Section 104(1)(b)(vi) provides for the consideration of relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan as part of the consideration of subdivision consent applications in any case.	Accept.	Yes. Delete SUB-RES-P1. Refer to section 10.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more efficient interpretation of the District Plan subdivision provisions by avoiding unnecessary duplication of a matter already provided for under section 104 of the RMA.
S028	S028.42	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain controlled activity status and notification preclusion for rule SUB-RES-Rx1 as notified.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S028	S028.43	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Oppose	Standard 3 is opposed. This duplicates Section 106 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and is not required.	Delete standard 3 of rule SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I disagree that this is a duplication of section 106 of the RMA. Section 106 only gives the Council discretion to decline a subdivision consent for a controlled activity (or grant with conditions) in circumstances where there is not sufficient provision for legal and physical access.  Standard 3, while similarly worded, achieves a different function. The standard ensures that legal and physical access is provided as part of controlled activity subdivision (rather than simply making it open to the Council to decline the consent where access is not provided). The standard also has the effect of setting the activity status for subdivision where legal and physical access is not provided (which would become a discretionary activity under SUB-RES-R30). This enables the Council to consider the broader range of effects that may related to non-compliance with the standard on a case-by-case basis.  I also note that inclusion of this standard in the rule is consistent with the other rules in the District Plan that provide for subdivision across the District.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.44	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Oppose	Standard 4 is opposed. This should only apply to vacant lot subdivision and be moved to a new Standard 2c.	Delete standard 4 of rule SUB-RES-Rx1 and replace with a new equivalent standard 2c.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider that it is only necessary that standard 4 apply to vacant allotments. Where allotments are not vacant (because they have an existing residential unit on them, or have resource consent for the development of new residential units), the provision of a flood free building area is managed under the land use rules for flood hazards in the NH-FLOOD chapter.  However, I do not consider that the standard should be deleted and relocated. Rather, I consider it should be amended so that it only applies to vacant allotments.	Accept in part.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-Rx1. Refer section 10.6 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more effective incorporation of the MDRS into the District Plan in relation to an existing qualifying matter, by avoiding reconsideration (under standard 4) of a matter that is already regulated under the land use rules in the NH-FLOOD chapter.
S206.FS.4	S028.44.FS01	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support as per Landlink submission and rationale provided in Infill Tapui Limited submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.45	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Oppose	Standard 5 is opposed. This should only apply to vacant lot subdivision and replace Standard 2a.	Delete standard 2a of rule SUB-RES-Rx1 and replace with standard 5. Delete standard 5.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Under rule SUB-RES-Rx1, standard 5 (which refers to SUB-RES-Table x1) already only specifies minimum allotment size and shape requirements for vacant allotments.  Standard 2a provides a different function standard 5. Standard 2a (which is complementary to 2b) ensures that subdivision can only occur as a controlled activity where it can be demonstrated that the land use rules for buildings in the General Residential Zone are complied with on the parent allotment, or where there is land use consent (for contravening these rules).  I consider it inappropriate to replace standard 2a with 5, because they achieve different purposes (one relates to compliance with land use rules, the other relates to minimum vacant allotment size).	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.46	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Oppose	Standards 7 and 8 are opposed. These standards should be removed because: a. There is no requirement for vehicle parking for three or less residential units and therefore no requirement for vehicular access. b. Pedestrian and cycling accesses only do not need to be limited to 6 lots. c. It is unclear if this rule applies when a land use consent has been granted (or is being sought in conjunction with a subdivision consent) for more than 6 residential units on a site. d. Standard 6 already requires access to be in accordance with engineering requirements. e. The building code access requirements also apply to development.	Delete standards 8 and 9 of rule SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Based on the reasoning in the submission, I have assumed the decision requested refers to standards 7 and 8 (not 8 and 9).  I agree with the submitter that standard 7 is intended to apply to vehicle access and should not apply to pedestrian access. Applying the standard to pedestrian access would result in illogical outcomes (for example, the entrance to an apartment building containing more than 6 unit titles would not comply with this standard).  I note that I have already recommended consequential amendment to this standard, under submission point S202.10 which I consider addresses the issue raised by the submitter.  In relation to standard 8, I consider that this continues to be relevant, because there are provisions in the Transport Chapter that are not provided for under the Council's <i>Land Development Minimum Requirements</i> referred to under standard 6).	Accept in part. Amend standard 7 so that it applies only to vehicle access.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-Rx1. Refer section 10.6 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to submission point 202.10.
S202.FS.1	S028.46.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support the intent of this submission and the relief sought as it aligns with primary submission regarding vehicle and pedestrian access.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.4	S028.46.FS02	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support as per Landlink submission and rationale provided in Infill Tapui Limited submission (i.e. potential retrospective management of effects, additionally rigid transport requirements do not allow flexibility which could support more sustainable modes of transport particularly in higher density areas).	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.47	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	Standard 9 should apply to all residential subdivision, not just Te Horo Beach.	Amend standard 9 of rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to apply to all residential subdivision.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I disagree. Te Horo Beach is the only area of the General Residential Zone that is not connected to the Council's reticulated water supply network. In the remainder of the General Residential Zone, firefighting water supply is provided through the reticulated water supply network.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.48	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose	This rule is opposed and should be removed and replaced by a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision that is not a controlled activity. The only Standard not in Rule SUB-RES-Rx1 is 6, relating to block length for lots less than 3,000m <sup>2</sup> .	Delete rule SUB-RES-R27 and replace with a restricted discretionary activity rule for subdivision that is not a controlled activity.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S028	S028.49	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	If this rule remains, then public and limited notification should be precluded.	If rule SUB-RES-R27 is retained, amend the rule to preclude public and limited notification.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S094.FS.1	S028.49.FS01	KiwiRail	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose primary submission	KiwiRail does not consider it is appropriate for limited notification to be precluded for high density developments that do not comply with the prescribed setback standards. In certain instances, including where the rail corridor setback is infringed, it may be appropriate for limited notification to KiwiRail as the owner of the rail corridor to ensure developments are appropriately designed in such a way as to ensure any adverse effects of that non-compliance can be adequately mitigated and managed through the consenting process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.49.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.49.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.50	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-R30	Oppose	This rule should be a restricted discretionary activity with the matters of discretion limited to those within Rule SUB-RES-R27. Standards 3 and 4 restrict intensification and unreasonably cascade vacant lot subdivision to the non-complying activity class based on density.	Delete rule SUB-RES-R30, including standards 2-4, and replace with a restricted discretionary activity rule with matters of discretion restricted to those within rule SUB-RES-R27. Public and limited notification should be precluded.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-R30. Refer section 10.10 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report for details.
S206.FS.4	S028.50.FS01	Landlink	SUB-RES-R30	Support primary submission	The submitter does not believe minimum lot size requirements for vacant lots will support/enhance the provision of infill development and that activity status given the permitted baseline around land use is overly restrictive. They suggest that a new minimum lot size is determined through analysis of size and lots that MDRS can be reasonably facilitated on - retention of 450m <sup>2</sup> reflects older provisions of the District Plan which did not account for MDRH. Acknowledge that this is a complex area and work may be constrained given short timeframes but a well considered new minimum lot size (if retention of a minimum lot size is considered appropriate) will likely lead to better urban design outcomes.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S028.50.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-RES-R30	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties. Retain limited notification for height rule breaches	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.50.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES-R30	Oppose primary submission	Neighbours should have a reasonable expectation about potential development on neighbouring properties.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.51	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-R32	Oppose	The MDRS provides a national direction for land use intensification, and this removes justification for non-complying activity subdivision because: a. Increased density through subdivision is anticipated within the policy framework and should not need to pass the 'gateway tests' of s104D. b. Qualifying matters and other rules already constrain development where it may be inappropriate to subdivide. c. Subdivision is not an unexpected activity in the urban environment that requires a precautionary approach to managing effects.  A discretionary activity is more appropriate for subdivision that is not a restricted discretionary activity.	Delete rule SUB-RES-R32 and replace with a restricted discretionary activity rule for subdivision.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-R32. Refer section 10.12 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report for details.
S206.FS.4	S028.51.FS01	Landlink	SUB-RES-R32	Support primary submission	General advice (Quality Planning) outlines that 'the non-complying activity status is intended for situations where it is intended consents only be granted in exceptional circumstances'. Given the potential permitted baseline through land use retaining a non-complying activity status for subdivision which do not meet minimum 450m lot size or 15m diameter circle is overly restrictive and not conducive to implementation of the NPS-UD. Suggest a new minimum lot size is determined through analysis of size of lots that MDRH can be reasonably facilitated on - retention of 450m <sup>2</sup> - just reflects older provisions of the District Plan which did not account for MDRH. Acknowledgement that this is a complex area and work may be constrained given short timeframes but a well-considered new minimum lot size (if retention of a minimum lot size is considered appropriate) will likely lead to better urban design outcomes.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.52	Infill Tapui Limited	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose	The minimum vacant lot area of 450m <sup>2</sup> and 18 metre diameter circle shape factor are opposed. The minimum vacant lot area should be 300m <sup>2</sup> (inclusive of access). The shape factor should be a 12-metre diameter circle.  These changes are consistent with the amendment to Objectives DO-03 and DO-Ox3 as well as policies GRZ-Px1 and GRZ-Px5. These changes are also consistent with amendments to Policy UFD-P4 which seeks to encourage a variety of densities and removes reference to 'traditional low density residential subdivision'.  A minimum vacant lot area of 300m <sup>2</sup> and 12 metre diameter shape factor are consistent with operative provisions for intensification (i.e. Focused Infill Precinct) and should be retained for the existing urban environment. This density is consistent with operative and proposed vacant lot areas and shape factors in District Plans for other tier 1 local authorities.	Amend the minimum vacant lot area to 300m <sup>2</sup> (inclusive of access) with a 12m diameter circle shape factor.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	While I consider that the minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor could be reduced to be more consistent with the MDRS, I am mindful that a vacant allotment, once subdivided, will enable the construction of 3 dwellings on that single vacant allotment as a permitted activity (not one). It is not clear to me from the information contained in the submission that a 300m <sup>2</sup> minimum allotment area is sufficient to accommodate 3 residential units.  I note that the Ministry for the Environment's Medium Density Residential Standards factsheet (see <a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf</a> ) illustrate three potential MDRS development outcomes each based on an approximate 420m <sup>2</sup> site area and a minimum site width of 13 metres. On this basis, I consider it appropriate to reduce the minimum vacant allotment size to 420m <sup>2</sup> and shape factor to 13 metres.  In any case, I note that: - There is no minimum allotment size or shape factor for allotments that have an approved land use consent (and this would include where land use consent is bundled with the subdivision consent); - In response to submission point S202.04, I have recommended that there be no minimum allotment size or shape factor where it can be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct residential units on the allotment that comply with rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 and GRZ-Rx3.	Accept in part. Amend the minimum vacant allotment area to 420m <sup>2</sup> and the minimum vacant allotment shape factor to 13 metres.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-Table x1. Refer to section 10.13 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor that is more consistent with the level of development anticipated by the MDRS.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S160.FS.2	S028.52.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose primary submission	<p>The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kāpiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.</p> <p>The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202.FS.1	S028.52.FS02	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-Table x2	Support primary submission	Support the intent and relief sought in this submission as it aligns with the reasons outlined in primary submission regarding reducing the allotment sizes for subdivision.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.4	S028.52.FS03	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x2	Support primary submission	Do not believe that minimum lot size requirements and diameter circles (particularly remaining the same as they were pre-MDRH) are an appropriate tool to manage (assumed amenity effects) of development. If any minimum lot sizes are retained they should be based on detailed analysis of what the minimum viable development is in accordance with MDRH standards for consistency. The concept of a circle does not seem an appropriate tool given that creative design may be integral to utilising sites which are not standard shape i.e. with the potential for positive design outcomes to be achieved.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.53	Infill Tapui Limited	Land Development Minimum Requirements	Oppose	<p>All references to the LDMR are opposed. The LDMR is not required to give effect to the IPI.</p> <p>The LDMR replaces material incorporated by reference and notice should have been given under Section 34(2)(c) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>Reference to the LDMR was not included in the draft consultation for this plan change. There has not been a reasonable opportunity to comment on the LDMR and its inclusion in the District Plan should be deferred to enable this.</p> <p>The submission also comments on several matters within the LDMR that are opposed, should be amended, or should otherwise be given consideration.</p>	<b>Do not replace</b> references to the Subdivision and Development Minimum Requirements, 2012 with the Land Development Minimum Requirements, April 2022 (LDMR).	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	<p>In relation to whether or not the LDMR is required to "give effect to the IPI", I note that section 5.2.5 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report states reasons why incorporating references to the LDMR is a matter that is in support of incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan.</p> <p>In relation to notice of and consultation on the proposal to incorporate references to the LDMR into the District Plan, section 3.5.3 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report describes the consultation undertaken, which includes the consultation required under clause 34 of Schedule 1 to the RMA.</p> <p>In relation to the specific comments on matters within the LDMR, I do not consider that the LDMR can be amended through recommendations on the IPI. However I note that the Section 32 Evaluation Report (p.122) identifies that the LDMR will be reviewed in the future, and these matters could be considered through that review.</p>	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.54	Infill Tapui Limited	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The extent of the Coastal Environment should be reduced to the Coastal Qualifying Matters Precinct. This is consistent with the NZCPS.	<b>Amend</b> the extent of the Coastal Environment to match the extent of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I do not consider that there are any rules in the District Plan that relate to the mapped extent of the Coastal Environment in the District Plan that are inconsistent with the MDRS or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I therefore consider it unnecessary to amend mapped extent of the Coastal Environment as part of PC2. I also do not consider there to be sufficient evidence to justify an alteration of the mapped extent of the Coastal Environment as part of PC2.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S028.54.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Evidence shows increased coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Ātiawa therefore support the increase in the spatial extent of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.54.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose primary submission	<p>Rather than follow the recommendations within this submission to reduce the Coastal Environment to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, the submitter believes the Coastal Environment area throughout the district should be increased. They believe that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions.</p> <p>The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.55	Infill Tapui Limited	General Residential Zone	Not specified	The General Residential Zone should be renamed Medium Density Residential to avoid confusion with having the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) apply to the General Residential Zone.	<b>Rename</b> the General Residential Zone as the Medium Density Residential Zone.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S028	S028.56	Infill Tapui Limited	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	Precinct B does not provide the intensification required to adequately implement the NPS-UD and the rationale for the 14 metre (4-storey) height limit is not justified.	<b>Delete</b> Residential Intensification Precinct B and <b>replace</b> with Residential Intensification Precinct A.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B, and the provisions associated with it (which enable 4-storey development) are consistent with the direction under Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to enable building heights and densities that are commensurate with the planned level of commercial activities and community services provided for by the Town and Local Centre Zones. I also consider that the provisions are justified on the basis of the position and function of the Town and Local Centre Zones within the District's centres hierarchy. I also consider that the amendment requested by the submitter does not recognise that Town and Local Centre Zones provide for commercial activities and community services to a lesser degree than the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S028.56.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Support primary submission	Support the intent of this submission that four stories should be amended to allow for at least six stories as per the relief sought in primary submission. Whether the starting point be six or seven stories should be determined by KCDC.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S028	S028.57	Infill Tapui Limited	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Oppose	The 1.2km distance is consistent with the 15-minute city concept and there is significant support for this approach to be considered best practice. The Ministry for the Environment guidance clearly supports walkable catchments for tier 1 local authorities that are greater than the 200m, 400m and 800m proposed for the Residential Intensification Precinct.	<b>Extend</b> Residential Intensification Precinct A as follows: a. 1.2km from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including Ōtaki Railway Station), the edge of city centre zones and the edge of metropolitan centre zones. b. 400m from neighbourhood centre zones, local centre zones, and town centre zones (or equivalent).	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	While I agree that the Ministry for the Environment guidance on implementing the intensification policies of the NPS-UD supports the consideration of walkable catchments that are larger than 800 metres, I consider that doing so requires justification.  I consider that there is unlikely to be any substantial benefit to increasing the size of the Residential Intensification Precincts. I note that the analysis of the feasibility and realisability of development within the precinct (outlined in Appendix M to the Section 32 Evaluation Report) identifies that overall there is likely to be a low realisation of apartment development in these areas. I also consider that increasing the size of the precincts would not contribute towards promoting higher density residential development in areas close to centres and rapid transit stops because it would enable such development (which is already not considered to be highly realisable) to be undertaken further away from these locations. Taking these matters into account, I do not consider that increasing the size of the Residential Intensification Precincts is justified.	Do not accept.	No.
S028	S028.58	Infill Tapui Limited	Definitions	Oppose	Residual flood hazards should not be a qualifying matter.	<b>Delete</b> residual flood hazards from the proposed definition of <i>qualifying matter area</i> .	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	The operative District Plan includes restrictions in areas subject to residual flood hazard, to account for possible breaching or overtopping of flood protection structures, or blockage and failure of overland flow paths, during the 1% AEP flood event. They are identified as an existing qualifying matter in section 6.1.1 and Appendix D of the Section 32 Evaluation Report in accordance with the requirements of sections 77K and 77Q of the RMA. I therefore consider it appropriate to retain residual flood hazards as part of the definition of <i>qualifying matter area</i> .	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.4	S028.58.FS01	Landlink	Definitions	Support primary submission	Landlink supports that residual flood hazards should not be a qualifying matter which inhibits MDRH is a proposal is able to comply with the relevant natural hazard rules e.g. NH-FLOOD rules.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.59	Infill Tapui Limited	Design Guides	Oppose	The dual typologies of 'terraced housing' and 'apartments or walk-ups' are opposed. These binary typologies are prescriptive. The full range of missing middle housing should be clearly articulated to ensure that housing variety and choice is promoted.	<b>Amend</b> the Design Guides to articulate the full range of missing middle housing to ensure that housing variety and choice is promoted.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I consider that this submission relates primarily to the Residential Design Guide, as the typologies mentioned by the submitter only occur in this Guide.  I understand this term "missing middle" to capture the broad range of housing types and tenures that exist between the stand-alone dwelling and the high-rise apartment (in other words, apartments serviced by a lift). 'Missing middle' typologies include semi-detached housing, terraced housing, co-housing, mixed-use housing (housing integrated with commercial activity), and low-rise walk-up apartments.  While the Residential Design Guide includes the categories 'terraced housing and town houses' and 'apartments and walkups', the purpose of doing so is to identify which guidelines are relevant to each of these broad categories. I do not consider that this limits a range of 'missing middle' housing typologies to be provided for within these categories (subject to meeting the requirements of other rules in the District Plan that may be relevant to the activity). I therefore consider it unnecessary for the Residential Design Guide to explicitly articulate the range of 'missing middle' housing typologies.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.4	S028.59.FS01	Landlink	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Support greater flexibility to enable innovative design solutions which promote greater housing type and choice.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.60	Infill Tapui Limited	Design Guides	Support	The design principles are supported because they are linked to the regional urban design principles as follows: a. Provide for Variety and Choice [V]: Choice. b. Integrate with Public Realm and Surroundings [I]: Context and Connections c. Provide for Appropriate Built Form and Design [A]: Character and Creativity d. Create a Comfortable and Safe Environment [S]: Custodianship and Collaboration.	<b>Retain</b> the design principles contained in the Design Guides as notified.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S028	S028.61	Infill Tapui Limited	Design Guides	Not specified	A section on the Te Aranga Māori Design Principles should be added.	<b>Amend</b> the Design Guides to add a section on the Te Aranga Māori Design Principles.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The Te Aranga Māori Design Principles are part of the Auckland Design Manual, which is a non-statutory design guide administered by the Auckland Council (see: <a href="https://www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/design-subjects/maori-design/te_aranga_principles">https://www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/design-subjects/maori-design/te_aranga_principles</a> ).  As I understand it, the Te Aranga Māori Design Principles have been developed in the Tāmaki Makaurau context, with the tangata whenua of that rohe. While the matter raised by the submitter is well intentioned, I consider that if there were to be Māori Design Principles incorporated into the Design Guides, these would need to be developed with the tangata whenua of the Kāpiti Coast district. Consideration would also need to be given to how these are to be applied in practice. In the absence of this process, I do not consider it appropriate to incorporate the Te Aranga Māori Design Principles into the Design Guides.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S028.61.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the review of the Design Guides to specifically reflect Ātiawa design principles. Develop and include design criteria that reflect Ātiawa values. Establish a design panel with tāngata whenua representation to adequately assess the design of development.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S028.61.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Develop and include design criteria that reflect mana whenua values. Establish a design panel with tāngata whenua representation to adequately assess the design of development.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S028	S028.62	Infill Tapui Limited	1-3 Karu Crescent, Waikanae	Oppose	Publicly owned open space land should be retained for future generations.  Open spaces provide significant opportunities for enhancing community wellbeing by: a. Encouraging active lifestyles and reducing stress. b. Attracting residents and businesses, creating job opportunities. c. Making the urban area more resilient to climate change. d. Increasing community engagement and reducing crime. e. Cleaning the air and improving public health.	<b>Reject</b> the proposed rezoning of 1-3 Karu Crescent from Open Space Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	I note the submitters opposition to the rezoning of 1-3 Karu Crescent, due to its existing zoning as Open Space. While I appreciate the submitters position in regards to the value of retaining public open space for public use, the reserve status for this piece of land has formerly been removed meaning it is no longer considered to be open space for public use. Therefore, the current zoning is now inconsistent with its use. The site provides limited recreational or general open space value, given its small size, location and flood hazard risk. It should also be noted that there are a range of other open spaces accessible within the area.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S028	S028.63	Infill Tapui Limited	17 Jean Hing Place, Otaki	Oppose	See submission point S028.62.	Reject the proposed rezoning of 17 Jean Hing Place from Open Space Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	I note the submitters opposition to the rezoning of 17 Jean Hing Place, due to it's existing zoning as Open Space. While I appreciate the submitters position in regards to the value of retaining public open space for public use, the reserve status for this piece of land has formerly been removed meaning it is no longer considered to be open space for public use. Therefore, the current zoning is now inconsistent with its use. The site is adjacent to a larger public open space which will remain as Open Space zoning in PC(N).	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S028.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission. Do not show any understanding of the local infrastructure limitations in Waikanae East, or consideration for the negative environmental and mental health effects of intensification. Need to better care for the well-being of the inhabitants.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S029	S029.01	Cole, Pauline	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S029.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S029.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged areas as they have been identified with potential of being affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S029	S029.02	Cole, Pauline	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S029.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S029.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S029	S029.03	Cole, Pauline	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S029.01 and S029.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S029	S029.04	Cole, Pauline	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S029.01 and S029.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S209.FS.1	S029.04.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209. Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth. The proposed "bakery" area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S029	S029.05	Cole, Pauline	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S029.01 and S029.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S029	S029.06	Cole, Pauline	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S029.01 and S029.02.	Alternatively, if submission S021.06 is not accepted, limit the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S029	S029.07	Cole, Pauline	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S029.01 and S029.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S030	S030.01	Grattan Investments Ltd	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S030.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S030.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S030	S030.02	Grattan Investments Ltd	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S030.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S031	S031.01	Ōtaki Revisited Limited	47 Te Roto Road, Ōtaki (Ōtaki Māori Racecourse)	Not specified	The submission relates to the Ōtaki Māori racecourse site. The submission opposes the existing zoning of the site as Rural Production Zone (Rural Plains Precinct).  Rezoning of the site will enable the development of approximately 600 homes, while supporting existing community activities occurring at the site, and enabling further commercial activities to support the village development and wider community.  The submission outlines several reasons why General Residential or Mixed-Use Zone is the most appropriate zone including: - There is a need for housing in Ōtaki; - Te Tupu Pai - Growing Well identifies Ōtaki as a growth node; - Ōtaki is identified as an "urban renewal area" in the Wellington Regional Growth Framework; - The area has recently secured funding to support the delivery of infrastructure from the Infrastructure Delivery Fund; - The site is not rural in character or function. In addition, the site is identified as LUC 3 on the NZLRI Land Use Capability 2021 maps. On this basis, it is considered that rezoning of the site will not result in the loss of rural production land; - Stormwater can be managed appropriately on site; - Wastewater can connect to Council's network upgrade through IAF funding; - Water supply can be provided to the site via existing planned and IAF funded upgrades; - The development can be sensitively integrated into the existing rural racecourse landscape; - Flood hazard risk can be appropriately mitigated on site; - The site can be developed to align with the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management.	<b>Rezone</b> 47 Te Roto Road, Ōtaki from Rural Production Zone (Rural Plains Precinct) to General Residential Zone or Mixed Use Zone, and any such other amendments to give effect to this submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S053.FS.1	S031.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	47 Te Roto Road, Ōtaki (Ōtaki Māori Racecourse)	Oppose primary submission	The greenfield development proposed is located away from existing centre zones, employment opportunities and accessibility to public and active transport modes meaning that the development of this area has the potential to result in an isolated, low density urban settlement.  Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.  Access from this site will be funnelled into SH1 at the intersection with Rahui Road. The effect of vehicle movements on this intersection will need to be considered.	Disallow primary submission. Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S031.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	47 Te Roto Road, Ōtaki (Ōtaki Māori Racecourse)	Oppose primary submission	NHOO do not agree with rezoning in this area as it is on our ancestral lands subject to current treaty negotiations and is a culturally significant contemporary site that requires a full site specific study and CIA. It is close to significant waterways and requires special consideration for care of the taiao. Do not approve any discharge into town wastewater system. Do not approve of establishment of a manufacturing business on the site. There is adequate provision in the DP for resource consents and requests for rezoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S032	S032.01	Mallia, James	2 Stetson Rise, Waikanae	Not specified	The subject land is a triangular portion of land bounded by the Kapiti Expressway, Ngarara Road and the Stetson Rise subdivision. All land to the south of the subject land is proposed to be rezoned to General Residential Zone as part of PC2.  Although the land is identified within the Ngarara Development Area, it is not within any of the neighbourhoods, identified in the Ngarara Development Area Structure Plan. The land sits within a now-revoked designation for Western Link Road, which was superseded by the Kāpiti Expressway. There are no specific structure plan provisions covering the site.  Surrounding land ownership, land use and infrastructure constraints limit any use of the land in accordance with the Ngarara Development Area Structure Plan provision. The land is separated from the rest of the structure plan area by the Kapiti Expressway and is too small itself to warrant any specific consideration under the provisions of the structure plan.  The land meets the criteria set for rezoning in the Section 32 report (an analysis is included in the submission).	<b>Rezone</b> 2 Stetson Rise, Waikanae from Ngarara Development Area to General Residential Zone.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter has requested the extension of the land proposed to be rezoned General Residential under PC(N) and has undertaken an assessment that demonstrates the site meets the four rezoning criteria established in the Section 32 Evaluation Report for PC2. While I agree with the submitters assessment generally, the site is entirely located within the expressway designation (NZTA-005 state highway purposes). The rezoning of the site would be inconsistent with the designation.  Therefore, I consider it inappropriate to extend the rezoning of 174-211 Ngarara Road under PC(N) to include 2 Stetson Rise.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S032.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	2 Stetson Rise, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	<i>The proposed rezoning of land is next to expressway. The health and amenity to future occupants living next to the expressway should be considered and managed, as well as access arrangements.</i>  <i>Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.</i>	Disallow primary submission. Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S033	S033.01	O'Brien, Nicola	General - Building heights	Oppose	Having greater than single storey homes will take away the town feel with the overcrowding. Semi rural views at the submitter's property will be changed to a sea of houses. One storey houses would be mor continuous with other dwellings in the area. Three storey buildings would block out the sun and views.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to keep building heights to one storey.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitter, the amendment sought is not consistent with the requirement for the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S033.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Building heights	Support primary submission	<i>Agree with the request to limit building heights</i>	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S033	S033.02	O'Brien, Nicola	General - Car parking	Oppose	No car parking means more cars and a lack of parking.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to require at least one car park per home.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Policy 11 of the NPS-UD prevents the District Plan from setting minimum car parking rate requirements.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S033	S033.03	O'Brien, Nicola	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	Infrastructure is substandard, and the doctor and chemist is at capacity.	<b>Sort out</b> the infrastructure to get more GPs and another chemist.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	In relation to the provision of infrastructure generally, I consider that this matter is most appropriately addressed through the Council's Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy. In relation to the provision of GP/doctors services and chemists, I note that both these activities are enabled by the District Plan in the district's Centres and Mixed Use Zones.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S033.03.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	<i>Agree with concerns about infrastructure. Is in line with NHO request for Infrastructure Qualifying matter.</i>	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S033	S033.04	O'Brien, Nicola	General - Flooding	Not specified	There are flooding issues, with low lying land and a high water table.	<b>Alleviate</b> the free flowing of water and flooding in Ōtaki.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S033.04.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Flooding	Support primary submission	<i>Agree with flooding and water table concerns and the request to facilitate flowing of waterways</i>	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S033	S033.05	O'Brien, Nicola	General	Not specified	Bring more interest to the beach with shops.	<b>Bring</b> more interest to the beach with shops etc.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I consider that the level of development enabled by PC2 may, over time, support the vibrancy and vitality of commercial centres located in or near beach areas, I consider that outcome sought by the submitter is unlikely to be effectively addressed through amendments to PC2.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S034	S034.01	Jones, Peter and Paul, Heather	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S034.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S034.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones and believe those areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S034	S034.02	Jones, Peter and Paul, Heather	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S034.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S035	S035.01	Hazlitt, Joanne	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S035.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S035.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones and believe those areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S035	S035.02	Hazlitt, Joanne	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S035.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S036	S036.01	Hazlitt, David	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S036	S036.02	Hazlitt, David	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S036.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S037	S037.01	Crockford, Geoffrey	District Plan Maps: PRECx1 Residential Intensification Precinct A	Not specified	This precinct zone extents should not apply 800 metres "as the crow flies" and must consider actual walking routes, some of which are longer than 800m & or greater than 10 minutes walk due to actual walking routes, and gradients.	<b>Amend</b> Residential Intensification Precinct A at Waikanae to actual 800 metre and 10 minute walking criteria.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	The identification of Residential Intensification Precinct A at Waikanae is based on the actual walking network in the area. Refer to Appendix E to the Section 32 Evaluation Report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S037	S037.02	Crockford, Geoffrey	Centres Zones and General Residential Zone: Residential Intensification Precincts	Not specified	There is No staged & planned expansion outward from targeted centres. This allows developers to cherry pick anywhere within large broad-brush zones, giving them considerable power to disrupt & manipulate many properties.  This uncontrolled expansion at the behest of developers would end up as a patchwork of mismatched intensification across these entire large broad-brush zones. It would not be planned for the benefit of the community & residents, rather it would be driven by profits for developers. A better approach would be to radiate intensification out from targeted centres at planned stages & times. This would focus intensification closest to targeted centres early on, to optimise intensification for the benefit of all parties. This would also be fair to residents in around targeted intensification zones to allow them time to adapt or consider moving as intensification radiates out in a planned, staged, & timely manner.	<b>Amend</b> the Residential Intensification Precincts to create three sub-zones that radiate out from targeted centres at incremental future times. Radiate intensification out from targeted centres at planned stages & times, to focus intensification closest to targeted centres early on.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	While I consider the approach requested by the submitter to be novel, I do not consider that the NPS-UD provides for a staged implementation of Policy 3.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S038	S038.01	Whiteley, Timothy	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S100.FS.1	S038.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S038.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S038	S038.02	Whiteley, Timothy	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S038.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S038.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones and believe those areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions.  The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S038	S038.03	Whiteley, Timothy	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S038.01 and S038.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S038	S038.04	Whiteley, Timothy	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S038.01 and S038.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S209.FS.1	S038.04.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209.  Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth.  The proposed 'bakery' area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.  Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S038	S038.05	Whiteley, Timothy	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S038.01 and S038.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S038	S038.06	Whiteley, Timothy	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S038.01 and S038.02.	Alternatively, if submission S038.06 is not accepted, limit the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S038	S038.07	Whiteley, Timothy	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S038.01 and S038.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S039	S039.01	Parnell, Ruth	District Plan Maps: PREC1 Residential Intensification Precinct A	Not specified	This precinct zone extents should not apply 800 metres "as the crow flies" and must consider actual walking routes, some of which are longer than 800m & or greater than 10 minutes walk due to actual walking routes, and gradients.	<b>Amend</b> Residential Intensification Precinct A at Waikanae to actual 800 metre and 10 minute walking criteria.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	The identification of Residential Intensification Precinct A at Waikanae is based on the actual walking network in the area. Refer to Appendix E to the Section 32 Evaluation Report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S039.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Centres Zones and General Residential Zone: Residential Intensification Precincts	Support primary submission	Support this submission. As further needs for more housing occur, there should be planned areas of development that are compact rather than scattered indiscriminately.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S250.FS.1	S039.FS01	Hudson, Matt	Centres Zones and General Residential Zone: Residential Intensification Precincts	Support primary submission	Relocating the 18m high building zones to be closer to existing retail hubs, specifically MacLean Street and the beach shop 'hub', would be a more sensible approach than spreading them throughout the suburb.  This would help to support the existing retail spaces during winter months when there are few customers.  It makes more sense to group these zones together around existing retail stores and public transport routes.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S039	S039.02	Parnell, Ruth	Centres Zones and General Residential Zone: Residential Intensification Precincts	Not specified	There is no staged and planned expansion outward from targeted centres. This allows developers to cherry pick anywhere within large broad-brush zones, giving them considerable power to disrupt and manipulate many properties.  Uncontrolled expansion at the behest of developers would end up as a patchwork of mismatched intensification across these entire large broad-brush zones. It would not be planned for the benefit of the community and residents, rather it would be driven by profits for developers.  A better approach would be to radiate intensification out from targeted centres at planned stages & times. This would focus intensification closest to targeted centres early on, to optimise intensification for the benefit of all parties. This would also be fair to residents in around targeted intensification zones to allow them time to adapt or consider moving as intensification radiates out in a planned, staged, and timely manner.	<b>Amend</b> the Residential Intensification Precincts to create three sub-zones that radiate out from targeted centres at incremental future times. Radiate intensification out from targeted centres at planned stages & times, to focus intensification closest to targeted centres early on.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	While I consider the approach requested by the submitter to be novel, I do not consider that the NPS-UD provides for a staged implementation of Policy 3.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S040	S040.01	Poole, Joanna	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not fully satisfy a range of policies in the NZCPS, whereas the Coastal Environment, as defined in the operative District Plan, does; - The s32 report does not fully comply with the NZCPS 2010. - Because the Operative District Plan is not compliant with NZCPS 2010, the area defined within the Coastal Environment must become the status quo.	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct whose landward boundary is the landward boundary of the area shown as the "Coastal Environment" in the District Plan. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S040	S040.02	Poole, Joanna	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	This approach better satisfies Policies 1, 6, 13, 14 and 19 contained within NZCPS 2010, whereas none of these policies are fully satisfied by the area currently defined as the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (CQMP).	Alternatively to submission point S040.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S040.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S040.02.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones and believe those areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S040	S040.03	Poole, Joanna	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements".	Amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S040	S040.04	Poole, Joanna	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The use of the Jacobs V2 lines to develop the CQMPs is not required by, and is inconsistent with clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020. - It is inappropriate to use the Jacobs report as a means to circumvent the required plan change that the Council has to promote on the Coastal Environment. It is an incomplete assessment and one that has not been subject to appropriate scrutiny.	Delete all evidence derived from the incorrect use of Jacobs V1 & V2. Amend S32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within Jacobs V1 & V2. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to section 4.11.1 of the body of the report for discussion on the use of the Jacobs Assessment as part of PC2.  I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and the Section 42A Report are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	Do not accept.	No.
S040	S040.05	Poole, Joanna	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements". - The guidance does not correctly state the law that it is telling councils how to administer.	Delete all evidence derived from the incorrect use of MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. Amend s32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	Do not accept.	No.
S041	S041.01	Murphy, Christine	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes allowing the construction of up to three 3 storey residential units on most sites. Kapiti especially has a lovely open, private, comfortable feel. High rise and tight in-fill building generates a feeling of stress and anxiety which I do not believe creates a good environment. I agree that there should be increased levels of development especially around transport hubs but NOT more than 2 level dwellings, unless it is on a new subdivision well away from current housing.	Reject Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S236.FS.5	S041.01.FS01	George, Megan; Fenwick, Ian	General	Support primary submission	Support S041.01. Existing development was not designed with 3-6 storey buildings among them. Concerns regarding sunlight, privacy, and amenity. Infrastructure is unable to support the amount of growth proposed. The creek floods into surrounding properties. Consideration should be made of geotechnical, sea level rise, extreme weather, earthquake impacts. This is a suburban area not near railway station or main shopping centres.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S041.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	Agree with the request to limit building heights	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S042	S042.01	Opperman, Reinier and Suzette	General	Oppose	The submission opposes the papakāinga provisions on the basis that they are exclusive to tangata whenua.	Amend Plan Change 2 to remove the words "tangata whenua" and replace them with "the people of Kapiti".	4.3 Papakāinga	As identified in the Section 32 Evaluation Report, the objectives, policies and rules that enable tangata whenua to develop papakāinga on ancestral land are part of giving effect to the Council's obligation under s6(e) of the RMA to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.  I consider that the amendments sought are not consistent with s6(e) of the RMA.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S042.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Oppose primary submission	Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori. Papakāinga are therefore unique to tangata whenua. Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. This includes the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of iwi, hapū and whānau. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S042.01.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because as the proposed papakāinga chapter states, papakāinga enable tangata whenua to develop and live on their ancestral whenua. This chapter aims to address the issues tangata whenua face when developing their land and help mitigate these specific issues so that iwi and Māori can reconnect with their whenua. Since these issues are unique to tangata whenua and papakāinga are taonga, it is important that papakāinga provisions are only for tangata whenua. Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori. Papakāinga are therefore unique to tangata whenua. Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. This includes the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of iwi, hapū and whānau.	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S042	S042.02	Opperman, Reinier and Suzette	General	Oppose	Refer to submission point S042.01.	Amend Plan Change 2 to remove the words "papakāinga housing developments" and replace them with "community housing developments".	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer S042.01.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S042.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Oppose primary submission	Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori. Papakāinga are therefore unique to tangata whenua. Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. This includes the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of iwi, hapū and whānau. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161.FS.1	S042.02.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because as the proposed papakāinga chapter states, papakāinga enable tangata whenua to develop and live on their ancestral whenua. This chapter aims to address the issues tangata whenua face when developing their land and help mitigate these specific issues so that iwi and Māori can reconnect with their whenua. Since these issues are unique to tangata whenua and papakāinga are taonga, it is important that papakāinga provisions are only for tangata whenua. Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori. Papakāinga are therefore unique to tangata whenua. Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. This includes the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of iwi, hapū and whānau.	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.01	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	General	Support	The submission supports the proposed changes to enable greater intensity on the Kāpiti Coast, rezoning of parts of the district to General Residential and enabling greater building heights in areas well serviced by public transport or a major activity centre.	No specific decision is requested on the provisions of Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S054.FS.1	S043.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission. SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first - to allow for much greater housing intensification - the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents - make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built) - reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station - when the railway line is further electrified to Otaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access - this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S043.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Oppose primary submission	These sites are subject to flooding risk. They should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Retain existing zoning	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.02	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	General	Support	The submissions supports the inclusion of a Papakāinga chapter.	No specific decision is requested on the provisions of Plan Change 2.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S043	S043.03	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road, Otaihanga	Not specified	Land was identified in Te Tupu Pai as high and medium priority greenfield growth, is well services and located away from any significant hazards.	Rezone the land bounded by Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	Do not accept.	No.
S235.FS.1	S043.03.FS01	Morris, Brent and Leanne	Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road, Otaihanga	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission point. Rezoning requests would create residential pockets in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There needs to be more planning than just allowing pockets of housing. Concerns regarding light pollution, impact of birds, reverse sensitivity of rural activities, lack of infrastructure.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S023.FS.1	S043.03.FS02	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	Ratanui Road and Otaihanga Road, Otaihanga	Support primary submission	The submission is consistent with R P Mansell, A J Mansell, & M R Mansell's own submission and the relief sought is supported because it seeks the rezoning of high and medium priority greenfield growth areas identified in Te Tupu Pai district growth strategy, would assist PPC2-1 to implement the outcomes sought in the NPS-UD, and would meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.04	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Land north of Manu Park, Waikanae	Not specified	See submission point S043.03.	Rezone the land north of the Manu Park development to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S043	S043.05	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	General	Not specified	Minimum height or land area provisions encourage consolidation and enable better integrated development. Wellington City Council's draft district plan proposes similar measures to limit under-development.	Consider minimum height or minimum land area provisions in Residential Intensification Precincts and Centres.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that the General Residential Zone (including the Residential Intensification Precincts) promotes the development of a variety of housing types (under objective DO-Ox2) and that the centres zones promote the development of a variety of activities (which is an outcome generally sought under objective DO-O16). While minimum height or minimum land area provisions may promote higher density development (by discouraging lower density development), they could also have the effect of dis-abling other types of development that may otherwise be desirable and contribute to the variety sought by the objectives.  I consider that the potential effects of minimum height or land area provisions should be carefully considered prior to being incorporated into a District Plan, and I do not consider there to be sufficient justification to provide for them as part of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.2	S043.05.FS01	Landlink	General	Support primary submission	Landlink supports this point as similarly made in their primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.06	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	General	Not specified	New buildings can significantly increase wind which can have an adverse effect on public amenity and safety as well as residential amenity.	Amend Plan Change 2 to include a wind effects chapter.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The introduction of a wind effects chapter would be a significant new matter that would require a level of research and evaluation that I consider would be beyond the scope of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S043.06.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief, as it is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S043.06.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	General	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief, as it is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S043.06.FS03	Nga Hapū o Otaki	General	Support primary submission	Effects on 'hau' as one of the impacts on taiao and tangata have not been appropriately considered in the plan changes	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.07	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	General	Not specified	Consider whether intensification above that enabled within the General Residential zoning around Kāpiti Airport have fully considered effects on aviation safety, in particular whether design measures need to be considered to minimise pilot distraction such as low glare roofing and lighting.	Consider effects on aviation safety.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that matters related to aviation safety are most appropriately managed through the airport designation (KCAHL-001). The provisions of the designation continue to apply regardless of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S043	S043.08	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	GRZ-Rx6 to Rx6	Not specified	Consider consolidation of very similar rules for ease of navigation and interpretation. Proposed rules GRZ-Rx4 to 6 are all very similar with subtle differences and should be incorporated into a single rule that states when and where public or limited notification is or isn't precluded, or variation to matters of discretion, rather than as 3 separate rules.	Consolidate proposed rules GRZ-Rx4 to 6.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I have recommended consolidating rules GRZ-Rx6 and GRZ-Rx7 in response to submission point S028.12.	Accept in part. Refer to submission point S028.12.	Yes. Amend GRZ-Rx6 (refer section 4.29 of PC(R1)). Delete GRZ-Rx7 (refer section 4.30 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to submission point S028.12.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S043	S043.09	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Land Development Minimum Requirements	Not specified	Adopt the Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012 (to be renamed the Land Development Minimum Requirements) so that future changes to standards would be subject to proper consultation as part of a plan change process.	Amend Plan Change 2 to adopt the Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012 (to be renamed the Land Development Minimum Requirements) into the District Plan as a Design Guide.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Section 3.5.3 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report describes the consultation undertaken on the proposal to incorporate references to the LDMR into the District Plan, which includes the consultation required under clause 34 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. On this basis, I consider that sufficient consultation was undertaken.	Do not accept.	No.
S043	S043.10	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Land Development Minimum Requirements	Not specified	The submitter does not believe that the "requirements" within the Land Development Minimum Requirements are compatible with medium density development. The feedback provided by Cuttriss as part of the consultation on the Land Development Minimum Requirements is included as an attachment to the submission.	Consider the feedback provided by Cuttriss on the Land Development Minimum Requirements.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	I do not consider that the LDMR can be amended through recommendations on the IPI. However I note that the Section 32 Evaluation Report (p.122) identifies that the LDMR will be reviewed in the future, and these matters could be considered through that review.	Do not accept.	No.
S043	S043.11	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Land Development Minimum Requirements	Not specified	Identifying the Land Development Minimum Requirements as a 'minimum' suggests that there can be no departure from the standards when the purpose of a resource consent is often to consider an alternative to not meeting the standard.	Reconsider the naming of the Land Development Minimum Requirements to something more akin to their actual purpose of the document being a Guideline, Principles or Standard.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	I do not consider that the title of the LDMR can be amended through recommendations on the IPI.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.2	S043.11.FS01	Landlink	Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support primary submission	Agree with rationale provided in submission and the need for a flexible but sustainable approach to infrastructure provision which can facilitate innovation, new technologies and viable solutions that may be alternative to prescriptive standards.	Allow primary submission.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.12	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	INF-MENU-R28	Not specified	The Act requires that a development of up to 3 dwellings and 3 storeys in the residential zones be permitted, where it meets all Medium Density Residential Standards, and not subject to a qualifying matter. There is no clear link between the requirement to provide rainwater tanks or outdoor taps and a qualifying matter under the Act.  It can be challenging to find sufficient space for the tanks, and they are often located within private open space, reducing the utility and amenity of these areas.	Amend Plan Change 2 to remove requirements for rainwater tanks and outdoor taps for up to 3 dwellings.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I do not consider that the requirement to provide rainwater tanks as a permitted activity standard is contrary to or conflicts with any of the requirements outlined under Schedule 3A of the RMA (the MDRS). I therefore do not consider that the requirement to provide rainwater tanks needs to be considered as a qualifying matter.  While I acknowledge that rainwater tanks can occupy site area where they are located above ground, I also note that the MDRS provide for a maximum building coverage of 50% of the site area require a minimum landscape area of 20%. This leaves 30% of the site area available for other purposes, including rainwater tanks.  On the basis that I do not consider the requirement to provide rainwater tanks to be contrary to the MDRS, and taking into account the policy INF-MENU-P19 (which requires new residential development to provide methods of water demand management, including rainwater storage tanks), I do not consider it appropriate to amend rule INF-MENU-R28 in the manner requested by the submitter.	Do not accept.	No.
S160.FS.2	S043.12.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	INF-MENU-R28	Oppose primary submission	The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kapiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.  The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S043.12.FS02	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	INF-MENU-R28	Oppose primary submission	Rainwater tanks have a critical role in managing the effects of intensification and be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o Te Wai. The site design should enable them to be located in the area designated for private open space. Retain the requirement for rainwater tanks.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S043.12.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	INF-MENU-R28	Oppose primary submission	Rainwater tanks have a critical role in managing the effects of intensification and be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o Te Wai. The site design should enable them to be located in the area designated for private open space.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S043	S043.13	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Flood hazard areas	Not specified	Consider whether flood hazard effects on site access should be assessed in addition to building location and floor levels, and include guidance as to how flood hazard effects on access could be addressed, having regard to the nature of the risk in terms of frequency, depth and velocity of floodwaters, ability for occupants' and emergency vehicle access, duration of flooding, and provision of alternative access during a major flood event.	Consider whether flood hazard effects on site access should be assessed in addition to building location and floor levels, and include guidance as to how flood hazard effects on access could be addressed.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Hazard	I consider that this matter can be assessed under policy NH-FLOOD-P13, which requires consideration of whether site access will be adversely effected by flood hazard. This policy would be engaged under several rules where resource consent is required, including: - Restricted discretionary activity rule SUB-DW-R7 (which relates to subdivision within specified flood hazard areas) requires that formed vehicle access does not adversely affect the 1% AEP flood hazard risk on other properties in the same flood catchment; - Controlled activity rule NH-FLOOD-R8 (which relates to development within a flood storage or fill control area), which includes suitability of access as a matter of control. - Restricted discretionary and non-complying activity rules for altered or new buildings in overflow paths, stream corridors or river corridors (NH-FLOOD-R12, NH-FLOOD-R16 and NH-FLOOD-R17).  I consider that methods for addressing the effects of flood hazard on site access are most appropriately assessed on a site specific basis through the resource consent process (as opposed to including guidance on this matter in the District Plan).	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S043	S043.14	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	Giving an expectation that a site can be developed to a higher intensity, without sufficient infrastructure capacity can result in significant delays and costs at the resource consenting stage. Examples include the proposed upzoning of Paekākāriki, which you've indicated would not be able to cater for increased growth due to wastewater constraints.	<b>Consider</b> only rezoning above the minimum level required by the Act where there is current, or planned increase in infrastructure capacity to cater for the growth.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	In relation to infrastructure capacity, I consider that the District Plan can only make the requirements of the MDRS or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD less enabling of development if it is necessary to do so to provide for a qualifying matter, and I have outlined in section 4.2.5 of the body of the report why I do not consider infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter. In relation to the specific matter of the lack of Council reticulated wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki, I note that this is described in section 6.1.6 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report.  I do not consider that enabling particular heights and densities of development in the District Plan should constitute an expectation that those densities can be achieved in practice, as development may be subject to a range of practical constraints (such as the need to provide for on-site waste water treatment and disposal) that mean those densities may not be feasible to achieve. I consider that the need to provide for on-site wastewater treatment and disposal in Paekākāriki would be a practical matter that ought to be known to those undertaking development, and I consider that any practical constraints that this places on how much development can be accommodated on any given site is a matter that ought to be resolved by the developer prior to the application for a resource consent.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.2	S043.14.FS01	Landlink	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support points made around upzoning and the broader potential adverse effects of intensification in areas which don't have viable/existing infrastructure provisions e.g. also in Te Horo - this situation warrants further investigation to ensure reasonable community development expectation and also to ensure sustainable development.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S043.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S044	S044.01	Heyne, Axel	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S044.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S044.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S044	S044.02	Heyne, Axel	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S044.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S045	S045.01	Le Harivel, John	General - Density Standards	Not specified	There is the lack of consideration of the effects on existing neighbours in terms of reduction in sunlight, light, privacy, view, and landscape, etc. There needs to be safeguards in terms of ensuring solar access not only within new developments but particularly to existing dwellings.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to require a specific number of hours of solar access to existing dwellings.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that solar access to adjacent sites is required to be managed by the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard. As such, I consider it inappropriate to include an additional standard to achieve a specified number of hours of solar access to existing dwellings.  I also consider that this would be an "other density standard" restricted under clause 2(2) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S045.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Density Standards	Support primary submission	Effects on access to 'ngā hiri o Tamanuitera' as one of the impacts on taiao and tangata have not been appropriately considered in the plan changes	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S045	S045.02	Le Harivel, John	General - Density Standards	Not specified	The boundary to height recession planes proposed are far too simplistic. Tools exist to ensure a much more nuanced approach that would improve the quality of design.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to provide different recession planes for different orientations.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendments sought are inconsistent with the height in relation to boundary standard required by the MDRS.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S045	S045.03	Le Harivel, John	General - Density Standards	Not specified	There is a lack of privacy and specific separation distances between habitable rooms. The 1m outlook requirement for bedrooms is diabolically bad as are the yard distances.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to adopt the Australian Standard that accounts for different heights of new buildings when considering separation distances.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I am unfamiliar with the Australian Standard referenced in the submission, and note that the District Plan must incorporate the outlook space standard required by the MDRS.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S045	S045.04	Le Harivel, John	General - Density Standards	Not specified	Increases in minimum floor to ceiling heights are required to ensure adequate solar penetration and the accommodation of services.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to increase minimum floor to ceiling heights.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that a minimum floor to ceiling height standard would be an "other density standard" restricted under clause 2(2) of Schedule 3A to the RMA.  I also note that minimum daylight requirements for interior environments, and requirements for the accommodation of services, are regulated under a range of clauses in part G of the New Zealand Building Code.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S045	S045.05	Le Harivel, John	General	Not specified	The wording of the proposed changes appears complex and confusing and needs to be simplified.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to simplify the wording used.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I acknowledge that some language used in District Plans can be technical in nature, I consider that the wording proposed by PC2 is generally fit for its intended purpose, or is wording required by the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S046	S046.01	Vickers, Amanda	General	Oppose	Increasing housing density is not conducive to healthy communities or healthy living. It will change the nature and spaces of our communities considerably. Space, back yards and trees are part of the Kiwi quarter acre dream which will slowly be eroded. A healthy community requires places for children to play, for nature to grow and space for gardens and leisure at home in our back yards.  Higher density housing should be reserved for inner city high rise apartments, not for those seeking space and quality of living on the Kāpiti Coast.	<b>Reject</b> the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) from being incorporated into the District Plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S236.FS.3	S046.01.FS01	George, Megan; Fenwick, Ian	General	Support primary submission	Support S046.01. Existing development was not designed with 3-6 storey buildings among them. Concerns regarding sunlight, privacy, and amenity. Infrastructure is unable to support the amount of growth proposed. The creek floods into surrounding properties. Consideration should be made of geotechnical, sea level rise, extreme weather, earthquake impacts. This is a suburban area not near railway station or main shopping centres.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S047	S047.01	Humphries, Nicholas	108 Elizabeth Street, Waikanae	Not specified	The submitter supports Proposed Plan Change 2, and wishes to see their land at 108 Elizabeth Street, Waikanae rezoned to General Residential Zone (Residential Intensification Precinct A) to enable intensive housing development.  The submitter supports the "Waikanae East" landholders group submission and the "Landmatters" group submission (submission S87).	<b>Rezone</b> 108 Elizabeth Street, Waikanae from Rural Production Zone (Rural Plains Precinct) to General Residential Zone (Residential Intensification Precinct A).	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S054.FS.1	S047.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	108 Elizabeth Street, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	Submission shows no understanding or concern for the local existing health and safety conditions in Waikanae East. This submission assumes that because roads exist in Waikanae East they are usable at all times and able to accommodate considerable population increase. Their land could offer great opportunities for new housing development, but this should only occur after the East-West connectivity issues between Waikanae East and the rest of the Kapiti Coast have been vastly improved. Suggest that the re-zoning of S047.01 and S087.01 be delayed until after Waikanae North has been re-zoned and developed, and a new school built in Waikanae North.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S100.FS.1	S047.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	108 Elizabeth Street, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S048	S048.01	Driver, Hugh	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S048.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S048.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S048	S048.02	Driver, Hugh	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S048.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S049	S049.01	Rowan, Jennifer	General - Density Standards	Not specified	Paekākāriki is a small and intimate village where land is scarce, and whatever is built should be blended into the landscape sensitively. Provision for the building of high-rise apartments will ruin the look and feel of the village. More important is to consider the impact of the proposed changes on Ngāti Haumia ki Paekākāriki who have been alienated from their land for many generations now, and most of the hapu have left the village because of the encroaching gentrification and unaffordability of the housing stock in the village.  Any further low density/low-rise buildings, comprising 1-2 storey stand alone dwellings, would integrate well into the limited spaces provided in and around the railway station, and be compatible with the surrounding landscape. This approach would continue to enhance and define the distinctive character of Paekākāriki. Paekākāriki railway station comprises several heritage buildings and what goes on around this precinct must retain and support the mana of that heritage.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to restrict the height of buildings across the village of Paekākāriki to no more than 2 storeys.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I note the matters raised by the submitter, sections 77G and 77N of the RMA require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I consider the amendments sought by the submitter are not consistent with this requirement.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S049	S049.02	Rowan, Jennifer	General - Housing variety and choice	Not specified	It would be more prudent to use the MDRS rules to allow for more small detached flats as well as tiny homes in the village, which would enhance its amenity and character value.	<b>Provide for</b> smaller flats and tiny homes to be added to properties across the village of Paekākāriki.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that where these meet the definition of a residential unit, PC2 would enable smaller flats and tiny homes to be added to properties across Paekākāriki.	<b>Accept.</b> Noting that I consider PC2 already provides for these matters.	<b>No.</b>
S049	S049.03	Rowan, Jennifer	General	Support	No specific reasons given.	<b>Provide for</b> the establishment of papakāinga development across the district.	4.3 Papakāinga	The provisions already provide for the development of papakāinga in a broad range of zones across the District. I note that I have made separate recommendations to extend the range of zones in response to submissions from Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai [S100] and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki [S203].	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S049	S049.04	Rowan, Jennifer	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, Wāhi Tapu	Support	Because of the submission's emphasis on supporting the local hapu and iwi generally in the District, the submission endorses the 'qualifying matters' and wishes to see the identified 'coastal precinct' and 'wāhi tapu' sites added to the list. This should include future sites that are identified, as well as new Marae takiwā Precinct areas, and Kārewarewa Urupā at Waikanae.	<b>Include</b> 'coastal precinct' and 'wāhi tapu' in the list of qualifying matters.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Under the definition of "qualifying matter area" proposed by PC2 (refer section 20.11 of PC(N)), I consider that 'coastal precinct' is provided for by "the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the General Residential Zone, Local Centre Zone or Town Centre Zone" and 'wāhi tapu' are provided for by "place and area of significance to Māori listed in Schedule 9".  On the basis that both matters identified by the submitter are provided for by the definition of "qualifying matter area", I do not consider any amendments are necessary.	<b>Accept.</b> Noting that I consider PC2 already provides for these matters under the definition of "QUALIFYING MATTER AREA".	<b>No.</b>
S104.FS.1	S049.04.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, Wāhi Tapu	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S050	S050.01	Poole, Quentin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not fully satisfy a range of policies in the NZCPS, whereas the Coastal Environment, as defined in the operative District Plan, does; - The s32 report does not fully comply with the NZCPS 2010. - Because the Operative District Plan is not compliant with NZCPS 2010, the area defined within the Coastal Environment must become the status quo.	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. <b>Replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct whose landward boundary is the landward boundary of the area shown as the "Coastal Environment" in the District Plan. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S050	S050.02	Poole, Quentin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	This approach better satisfies Policies 1, 6, 13, 14 and 19 contained within NZCPS 2010, whereas none of these policies are fully satisfied by the area currently defined as the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (CQMP).	Alternatively to submission point S050.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S050.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S050.02.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S050	S050.03	Poole, Quentin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements".	<b>Amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S050	S050.04	Poole, Quentin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The use of the Jacobs V2 lines to develop the CQMPs is not required by, and is inconsistent with clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020. - It is inappropriate to use the Jacobs report as a means to circumvent the required plan change that the Council has to promote on the Coastal Environment. It is an incomplete assessment and one that has not been subject to appropriate scrutiny.	<b>Delete</b> all evidence derived from the incorrect use of Jacobs V1 & V2. Amend S32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within Jacobs V1 & V2. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to section 4.11.1 of the body of the report for discussion on the use of the Jacobs Assessment as part of PC2.  I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S050	S050.05	Poole, Quentin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements". - The guidance does not correctly state the law that it is telling councils how to administer.	<b>Delete</b> all evidence derived from the incorrect use of MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. Amend s32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S051	S051.01	Franks, Jeffery	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes incorporating the government's MDRS into the District Plan.	<b>Reject</b> the government's MDRS and do not incorporate them into the District Plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S051.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	NHO oppose the MDRS for Ōtaki.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S052	S052.01	Catchpole Wynne Ltd	Otaihanga Road and Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Not specified	The submission opposes not rezoning the sites at 115/117 Ratanui Road and 86 Otaihanga Road, as well as the larger block within which these sites are located, from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.  The submission states that this would give effect to policy 2 of the NPS-UD. Reasons include: - Rezoning of the site would provide for it to be plan-enabled under the NPS-UD; - The area is indicated as a medium priority greenfield growth area in Te Tupu Pai; - Not rezoning the land now would otherwise result in further fragmentation of the land into lifestyle blocks, which will limit the ability of the land to accommodate urban growth in the future; - The site already meets the definition of being infrastructure-ready under the NPS-UD; - There is no indication that development of the site for residential would not be feasible or reasonably expected to be realised; - There are no qualifying matters that would preclude the rezoning of the land to General Residential Zone.	<b>Rezone</b> the entire block of land bounded by Otaihanga Road to the east and Ratanui Road to the south, as identified in the submission, from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S235.FS.1	S052.01.FS01	Morris, Brent and Leanne	Otaihanga Road and Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission point. Rezoning requests would create residential pockets in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There needs to be more planning than just allowing pockets of housing. Concerns regarding light pollution, impact of birds, reverse sensitivity of rural activities, lack of infrastructure.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S023.FS.1	S052.01.FS02	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	Otaihanga Road and Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Support primary submission	The submission is consistent with R P Mansell, A J Mansell, & M R Mansell's own submission and the relief sought is supported because it seeks the rezoning of high and medium priority greenfield growth areas identified in Te Tupu Pai district growth strategy, would assist PPC2-1 to implement the outcomes sought in the NPS-UD, and would meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S052.01.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Otaihanga Road and Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Oppose primary submission	These sites are subject to flooding risk. They should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Retain existing zoning	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.01	Waka Kotahi	DO-O3	Support in part	Waka Kotahi requests that this objective be widened to include consideration of accessibility to all modes of transport including active modes.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O3 to include consideration of accessibility to all modes of transport including active modes.  3. ... b. that are well serviced by existing or planned public or active transport, or ...	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested by the submitter is consistent with Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend DO-O3 (refer section 1.2 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for improved recognition for active transport in a manner that is consistent with Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S053.01.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O3	Support primary submission	The submitter seeks a number of amendments to recognise the significance of accessibility to all modes of transport for areas of intensification to achieving well-functioning urban environments. Greater Wellington support the changes requested by Waka Kotahi to ensure appropriate consideration and provision of accessibility to all modes of transport, particularly active and public transport.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S053.01.FS02	Nga Hapu o Otaki	DO-O3	Support primary submission	NHoO support the inclusion of transport in this section	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.02	Waka Kotahi	DO-O3	Support	Waka Kotahi supports enabling more people to live within Kapiti's existing urban environments, particularly in recognising the need for urban environments to be well connected to transport and infrastructure in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to DO-O3 in response to other submissions.	No.
S053	S053.03	Waka Kotahi	DO-Ox3	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the addition of DO-Ox3 as it implements the higher density housing and increased accessibility in accordance with the NPS-UD	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S053	S053.04	Waka Kotahi	DO-O16	Support	Waka Kotahi support the objective to provide higher densities in DO-O16.5 as it implements the NPS-UD and the MDRS.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S053	S053.05	Waka Kotahi	UFD-Px, UFD-P1, UFD-P4	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the implementation of the heights and densities in accordance with the NPS-UD and MDRS	Retain as notified	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to these provisions in response to other submissions.	No.
S053	S053.06	Waka Kotahi	PK-Px4	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports enabling Papakāinga development to provide for the aspirations of tangata whenua and requests that PK-Px4 include appropriate provision of access as a limitation of the site.	Amend PK-Px4 as follows: ... 1. adequate provision of access, on-site or off-site infrastructure to serve the papakāinga; and ...	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. I consider appropriate access is a matter that relates to the provision of infrastructure, and as a result it is both consistent to include this in the policy. It will also assist users of the policy, who might otherwise focus on the provision of reticulated infrastructure, to turn their mind to matters of access.	Accept. To improve interpretation as a result of other recommendations on this policy, I also recommend splitting out clause 1 of PK-Px4 into a list.	Yes. Amend PK-Px4. Refer section 3.1 of PC(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for clearer interpretation of the policy. I also consider this to be consistent with the NPS-UD, which recognises land transport infrastructure as part of the definition of development infrastructure.
S053	S053.07	Waka Kotahi	General Residential Zone: Introduction, GRZ-Px6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed changes to the General Residential Zone in terms of incorporating the MDRS and enabling a mix of densities with higher densities enabled in the residential intensification precincts (A & B) and implements the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to these provisions in response to other submissions.	No.
S053	S053.08	Waka Kotahi	GRZ-P9	Support in part	Waka Kotahi request an amendment of GRZ-P9 to recognise that accessibility is an important part of a well-functioning urban environment as stated in the NPS-UD. Encouraging increased access to active and public modes encourages mode shift and has the potential to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases which is consistent with the Wellington Regional Policy Statement Proposed Plan Change 1 (Objective 22 Policy G84 and 57).	Amend GRZ-P9 as follows: ... 3. transport choice and efficiency and accessibility to active or public transport will be maximised; ...	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested by the submitter is consistent with Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD.	Accept.	Yes. Amend DO-O3 (refer section 1.2 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for improved recognition for accessibility to public and active transport in a manner that is consistent with Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD.
S197.FS.1	S053.08.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P9	Oppose primary submission	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 relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow primary submission, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097.FS.1	S053.08.FS02	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRZ-P9	Support primary submission	The submitter seeks a number of amendments to recognise the significance of accessibility to all modes of transport for areas of intensification to achieving well-functioning urban environments. Greater Wellington support the changes requested by Waka Kotahi to ensure appropriate consideration and provision of accessibility to all modes of transport, particularly active and public transport.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094.FS.1	S053.08.FS03	KiwiRail	GRZ-P9	Support primary submission	KiwiRail supports amendments to ensure accessibility to active and public transport is maximised.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.10	S053.08.FS04	Landlink	GRZ-P9	Support primary submission	Support changes to GRZ-P9 policy which increases access to public and active transport modes - planned or existing (give effect to policies for the NPS-UD).	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S053.08.FS05	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ-P9	Oppose primary submission	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow primary submission, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.09	Waka Kotahi	MCZ-P2	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the Metropolitan Centre Zone Precincts in principle and request that accessibility to active and public transport is also included as a management principle. Facilitating increased access to active and public modes supports a well-functioning urban environment, encourages mode shift and is likely to result in a reduction in greenhouse gases.	Amend MCZ-P2 as follows: ... 1. ... a. Accessibility to active or public transport, transport circulation and integration within the surrounding Metropolitan Centre precincts and the rail interchange, is improved; ... 2. ... a. Accessibility to active or public transport, transport circulation and integration within the surrounding Metropolitan Centre precincts will be provided, while reinforcing the development of Rimu Road as the Metropolitan Centre's Main Street; ... 3. ... a. Accessibility to active or public transport, transport circulation and integration within the surrounding Metropolitan Centre precincts will be provided for; ...	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested by the submitter is consistent with Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD.	Accept.	Yes. Amend DO-O3 (refer section 1.2 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for improved recognition for accessibility to public and active transport in a manner that is consistent with Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197.FS.1	S053.09.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-P2	Oppose primary submission	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 relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow primary submission, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097.FS.1	S053.09.FS02	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MCZ-P2	Support primary submission	The submitter seeks a number of amendments to recognise the significance of accessibility to all modes of transport for areas of intensification to achieving well-functioning urban environments. Greater Wellington support the changes requested by Waka Kotahi to ensure appropriate consideration and provision of accessibility to all modes of transport, particularly active and public transport.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094.FS.1	S053.09.FS03	KiwiRail	MCZ-P2	Support primary submission	KiwiRail supports amendments to ensure accessibility to active and public transport is maximised.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S053.09.FS04	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MCZ-P2	Oppose primary submission	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow primary submission, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.10	Waka Kotahi	MCZ-P8	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the Centres Design Guide and a maximum building height of 12 stories in the Metropolitan Centre Zone as this enables increased urban density in accordance with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S053	S053.11	Waka Kotahi	TCZ-P6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the Centres Design Guide and a higher density of urban form in the Town Centre Zone with maximum building height of 6 stories. This enables increased urban density in accordance with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S053	S053.12	Waka Kotahi	LCZ-P6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the Centres Design Guide and higher density of urban form in the Local Centre Zone. This enables increased urban density in accordance with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S053	S053.13	Waka Kotahi	MUZ-P7	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the Centres Design Guide and a higher density of urban form in the Mixed Use Zone. This enables increased urban density in accordance with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S053	S053.14	Waka Kotahi	FC-P3	Support	Waka Kotahi is generally supportive of the use of financial contributions for up to 100% of the costs or land necessary to offset any adverse environmental effects or infrastructure upgrade that cannot otherwise be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Retain as notified.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations have been made to amend the provisions in response to other submissions.	No.
S053	S053.15	Waka Kotahi	FC-Table x2	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions for Transport Infrastructure and request an amendment to enable the potential collection of financial contributions for access to and provision for alternative transport modes.	Amend FC-Table x2 - Financial Contribution payable provisions to allow financial contributions to be collected for access to or provision for alternative transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport.	4.17 Financial Contributions	I consider that the provisions for transport infrastructure identified in FC-Table x2 are not limited to any particular mode of transport, so I consider it unnecessary to amend the provision in the manner sought by the submitter.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.10	S053.15.FS01	Landlink	FC-Table x2	Support primary submission	Support further exploration of financial contributions to be potentially used to support alternative transport modes (give effect to policies for the NPS-UD).	Allow primary submission.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S053.15.FS02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FC-Table x2	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports the promotion of alternative transport modes but opposes the relief sought as it does not consider situations where Council may not have any plans for alternative transport modes to be provided.	Disallow primary submission.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S053.15.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FC-Table x2	Support primary submission	Ātiawa have submitted that housing should be supported by life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs. Ensuring that developments are linked to transport hubs should be a key consideration of housing design and development. Amend as proposed by 053.15	Allow primary submission.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.16	Waka Kotahi	269-289 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	Waka Kotahi have concerns with the proposed greenfield rezoning of 269-289 Ngarara Road, Waikanae from future urban zone to general residential zone. The development, due to its location and site constraints, is likely to be low density with limited access to public transport resulting in increased dependency on private vehicle use and reduce mode shift (to active or public transport modes) and increase transport related greenhouse gases - inconsistent with aspects of the WRPS proposed change 1 that focuses on encouraging urban intensification, enabling mode shift and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gases.	Request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issues.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter opposes the rezoning proposed by PC(N) for several reasons. I address these reasons below. The information for this site is summarised in Appendix V of the Section 32 Report, which references more detailed information contained in Appendix O. Flood hazards at the site are assessed in Appendix P of the S32 Report.  Any constraints on site (as summarised in Appendix V, O and P) can be managed through operative district plan provisions.  Access to public and active transport - Regarding active transport, the site has good access to the multi-modal walking, cycling and bridle way along the Kapiti Expressway. Mode shift is enabled through connection to active transport networks which have reasonable access to public transport networks.	Do not accept.	No.
S184.FS.1	S053.16.FS01	Watters, Jonathan and Rachel	269-289 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	The submission made by Waka Kotahi does not accurately reflect the current situation or future development potential in the Ngāraara area. - The proposed site for re-zoning borders both residential zones, which can be intensified as MDRH rules incorporated into the plan) and borders the 'Future Urban Zone'. - The proposed sites for rezoning fall within the 'Waikanae Urban Edge' which is a planned area for development. - Waka Kotahi's concerns are regarding the accessibility of the site. All sites are accessible from existing road networks and cycling routes. The proposed areas for rezoning are all reasonably accessible by active modes. A notional road is shown on the Road Hierarchy which would increase connectivity to proposed sites. - Currently there are only 2 public transport routes in Waikanae. If this is due to demand feasibility, an increase in growth would increase demand and the viability of public transport.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S183.FS.1	S053.16.FS02	Puke Ra Ltd	269-289 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	The submission made by Waka Kotahi does not accurately reflect the current situation or future development potential in the Ngāraara area. - The proposed site for re-zoning borders both residential zones, which can be intensified as MDRH rules incorporated into the plan) and borders the 'Future Urban Zone'. - The proposed sites for rezoning fall within the 'Waikanae Urban Edge' which is a planned area for development. - Waka Kotahi's concerns are regarding the accessibility of the site. All sites are accessible from existing road networks and cycling routes. The proposed areas for rezoning are all reasonably accessible by active modes. A notional road is shown on the Road Hierarchy which would increase connectivity to proposed sites. - Currently there are only 2 public transport routes in Waikanae. If this is due to demand feasibility, an increase in growth would increase demand and the viability of public transport.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S241.FS.1	S053.16.FS03	Jones, Steve and Sue	269-289 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	The submission made by Waka Kotahi does not accurately reflect the current situation or future development potential in the Ngarara area. - The proposed site for re-zoning borders both residential zones, which can be intensified as MDRH rules incorporated into the plan) and borders the 'Future Urban Zone'. - The proposed sites for rezoning fall within the 'Waikanae Urban Edge' which is a planned area for development. - Waka Kotahi's concerns are regarding the accessibility of the site. All sites are accessible from existing road networks and cycling routes. The proposed areas for rezoning are all reasonably accessible by active modes. A notional road is shown on the Road Hierarchy which would increase connectivity to proposed sites. - Currently there are only 2 public transport routes in Waikanae. If this is due to demand feasibility, an increase in growth would increase demand and the viability of public transport.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.17	Waka Kotahi	174-211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	Waka Kotahi have concerns with the proposed greenfield rezoning of 174-211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae from future urban zone to general residential zone. The development, due to its location and site constraints, is likely to be low density with limited access to public transport resulting in increased dependency on private vehicle use and reduce mode shift (to active or public transport modes) and increase transport related greenhouse gases - inconsistent with aspects of the WRPS proposed change 1 that focuses on encouraging urban intensification, enabling mode shift and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gases.	<b>Request</b> further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issues.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter opposes the rezoning proposed by PC(N) for several reasons. I address these reasons below. The information for this site is summarised in Appendix V of the Section 32 Report, which references more detailed information contained in Appendix O. Flood hazards at the site are assessed in Appendix P of the S32 Report.  Any constraints on site (as summarised in Appendix V, O and P) can be managed through operative district plan provisions.  Access to public and active transport - Regarding active transport, the site has good access to the multi-modal walking, cycling and bridle way along the Kapiti Expressway. Mode shift is enabled through connection to active transport networks which have reasonable access to public transport networks.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S224.FS.2	S053.17.FS01	Simpson, Vanessa and Guy	174-211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submission made by Waka Kotahi because the submission fails to recognise that the properties at 205 and 211 Ngarara Road already fall within an urban environment context. The change to a General Residential zone is sensible and logical allowing the properties to be unlocked for development as intended. The properties at 205 and 211 Ngarara Road do not adjoin the Kapiti expressway and furthermore they: - have long been signalled for residential development; - are located between the existing Waikanae township and the Ngarara zoned land to the North; - fall within the Waikanae North Urban Edge in the KCDC Operative District Plan 2021; and - have already been reviewed in terms of their suitability for residential subdivision (including as detailed in the s.32 Evaluation Report Appendix O).	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.18	Waka Kotahi	160-222 Main Road and 39 Rongomau Lane, Paraparaumu	Oppose	Waka Kotahi have concerns with the proposed greenfield rezoning of 160-222 Main Road & 39 Rongomau Lane, Raumati South, Paraparaumu from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone. In particular, stormwater constraints for 39 Rongomau Lane and 160-222 Main Road as both are low lying with the presence of flood hazard and wetlands. In addition, the development is likely to be low density with limited access to public transport resulting in increased dependency on private vehicle use and reduce mode shift (to active or public transport modes) and increase transport related greenhouse gases - inconsistent with aspects of the WRPS proposed change 1 that focuses on encouraging urban intensification, enabling mode shift and a reduction in transport related greenhouse gases.	<b>Request</b> further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issues.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter opposes the rezoning proposed by PC(N) for several reasons. I address each point below. The information for this site is summarised in Appendix V of the Section 32 Report, which references more detailed information contained in Appendix N. Flood hazards at the site are assessed in Appendix P of the S32 Report.  The provisions of the NH-FLOOD chapter manage flood hazards and setback from waterbodies (including wetlands). There are no identified wetlands in this area, but these are managed by NES-F and the provisions of the flood chapter.  Access to public and active transport - Regarding active transport, the site has good access to the multi-modal walking, cycling and bridle way along the Kapiti Expressway. Regarding public transport, while it's not within a walkable catchment of the Paraparaumu Train Station, it's between 1.5-2km from the station and there is access to the train station and metropolitan network via active networks along the Kapiti Expressway and old state highway 1. Mode shift is enabled through connection to active transport networks which have reasonable access to public transport networks.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S101.FS.1	S053.18.FS01	Toka Tū Ake EQC	160-222 Main Road and 39 Rongomau Lane, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Toka Tū Ake agrees that greenfield development in areas subject to natural hazard risk, in this case flooding, should only be undertaken where such development is strictly necessary, and where the hazard risk has been fully investigated and reduced to minimum levels for residents. Further site-specific investigation of stormwater constraints in new greenfield residential developments in areas at risk of flooding is recommended to minimise any risk posed by excess stormwater runoff and flooding.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053	S053.19	Waka Kotahi	Design Guides	Support	Waka Kotahi support the Residential Design Guide (Appendix B) referenced in the General Residential Zone Policies and Rules. These guidelines provide a good practice design guide to implement the NPS-UD and MDRS.	<b>Retain</b> the Residential Design Guide as notified.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I agree with the submitter, although I note that recommendations to amend the Residential Design Guide are made in relation to other submission points.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting that recommendations to amend the Residential Design Guide are made in relation to other submission points.	<b>No.</b>
S053	S053.20	Waka Kotahi	Design Guides	Support	Waka Kotahi support the Centres Design Guide (Appendix C) referenced in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone and District Wide Subdivision Matter Chapter and Policies and Rules. These guidelines provide a good practice design guide to implement the NPS-UD and MDRS.	<b>Retain</b> the Centres Design Guide as notified.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I agree with the submitter, although I note that recommendations to amend the Centres Design Guide are made in relation to other submission points.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting that recommendations to amend the Centres Design Guide are made in relation to other submission points.	<b>No.</b>
S053	S053.21	Waka Kotahi	Appendix E	Support	Waka Kotahi generally support the Section 32 Evaluation Report: Appendix E - Spatial Application of the NPS-UD walkable catchment intensification Policies and note that these are implemented in Proposed Plan Change 2.	No specific decision on Plan Change 2 is requested.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>No recommendation.</b> No decision requested.	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054	S054.01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Px6	Oppose	The submission opposes the application of GRZ-Px6 to the Waikanae East (Hemi Matenga) side of the railway tracks at Waikanae. The submission describes reasons in detail, which include: - The area already has recognised connectivity issues, as there is only one public road connecting the area with the rest of Kāpiti. This is exacerbated by the rail crossing and traffic lights, which cause bottle necks - There are a range of health and safety implications for increasing Hemi Matenga's population density before installing better east-west connectivity. - A lack of access to emergency services; - A lack of access to life-sustaining services; - Vulnerable population clusters already exist in Hemi Matenga in the event of a fire; - Fire risk in Hemi Matenga is exacerbated by climate change; - There are issues with access to schools.  The submission also describes possible solutions to these issues, and references aspects of the NPS-UD and S32 report in support of the submission.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Px6 to exclude Hemi Matenga until such time as health and safety matters are addressed regarding east-west connectivity issues.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	As I understand it, the submission relates to the area of Waikanae located to the east of the railway line.  Policy GRZ-Px6 relates to the application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. While I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitter regarding the accessibility of the area, I consider that the District Plan can only make the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD less enabling of development if it is necessary to do so to provide for a qualifying matter, and I have outlined in section 4.2.5 of the body of the report why I do not consider infrastructure provision to be a qualifying matter. I consider that the matters raised by the submitter are most appropriately addressed through the Council's Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy.  In relation to provision for emergency services facilities, I consider that the District Plan enables these facilities to be developed in the General Residential Zone, Town Centre Zone and General Industrial Zone (including in the areas to the east of the railway line at Waikanae), should emergency services providers consider this to be necessary to cater to population growth.  In relation to the provision for schools, I consider that this matter primarily rests with the Ministry of Education, which as a requiring authority has the power to designate land for new schools.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S087.FS.1	S054.01.FS01	Waikanae East Landowners	GRZ-Px6	Oppose primary submission	<i>The reason given to reject rezoning the rural zoned land identified in the submission (#S087) is insufficient justification given the requirements under the National Policy Statement for Urban Development as required to be given effect to by all Tier 1 Councils in respect of urban environments. The NPS-UD has not identified roading connectivity as a qualifying matter under section 3.32 of the NPS-UD and therefore the IPI can not include. We submit that the submission by Malu Jonas is out of scope.</i>  <i>Furthermore, the Council is already working with Kiwi Rail and Waka Kotahi to identify alternative access routes across the North Island Main Truck Railway Line (NIMTR). An alternative emergency access has already been installed north of the Waikanae Railway station.</i>  <i>Provision of access in accordance with the relevant standards is a matter that Council has reserved its discretion over for all resource consents for subdivision and development and will be addressed through that process.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S054	S054.02	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Px6	Oppose	The submission states that it is important that Whakarongotai Marae be able to sight its maunga (mountain) from its site. Whether they choose Hemi Matenga or Kapakapanui as their maunga of choice, is their choice. For cultural and spiritual reasons, they need to be able to connect with local land/sea forms that are most relevant to their marae and turangawaewae. In the case of Whakarongotai Marae, it is the spiritual connection to their maunga (mountain).	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Px6 to prevent high-rise high-density housing initiatives within the view shaft between Marae and culturally important lands or waterbodies (e.g. Between Whakarongotai Marae and relevant maunga).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that this matter is addressed by the provision of the Marae Takiwā Precinct as part of PC2, which limits building heights on sites adjacent to Whakarongotai Marae.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S054.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Px6	Support primary submission	<i>The wellbeing of Whakarongotai is currently impacted by the surrounding development. Any further development will intensify those impacts including on our ability to connect with Kapakapanui.</i> <i>Establish Marae Takiwā Precinct. Retain the GRZ-Px8 Marae Takiwā Precinct matters to be avoided, remedied and mitigated. Retain the policy providing for buildings up to 2-storeys.</i> <i>The land surrounding Whakarongotai, in the ownership of KCDC managed entities, is restricted to the current developed height.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission in part.</i>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S203.FS.1	S054.02.FS02	Nga Hapū o Otaki	GRZ-Px6	Support primary submission	<i>Support changes to PC2 that recognise and provide for viewshafts from Marae and culturally significant areas</i>	<i>Allow primary submission in part.</i>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S054	S054.03	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Rx6	Support in part	The submission identifies that it is common-sense that extensive high-rise apartment structures that provide affordable housing be built in central town areas, especially above existing carparks and retail space.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx6 so as to prioritise the intensive building of affordable housing in multi-storey buildings above existing centrally located car park areas and retail spaces.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that PC2 already enables the greatest degree of development to occur within and adjacent to the District's metropolitan, town and local centres. In relation to the specific matter of affordable housing, I note that PC2 enables all types of housing. However I consider that incorporating provisions to incentivise the provision of affordable housing (as distinct from other types of housing) would require considerable research and evaluation, including defining the meaning of "affordable housing" and developing appropriate and effective provisions to incentivise it. I consider this to be beyond the scope of PC2 and what can be reasonably achieved within the ISPP.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S054.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Rx6	Support primary submission	<i>It is clear that many other submissions also share concerns that critical infrastructure needs to be developed in general before intensification proceeds on the Kapiti Coast. Suggest the following Amendment: That Infrastructure be made a Qualifying Matter, as has been the case in Johnsonville and Auckland.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S054	S054.04	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Px8, GRZ-Rx3	Support	The submission supports designated Marae areas having less intense urban density. There are a number of spiritual and cultural reasons why Marae need more 'space' and more privacy.	<b>Retain</b> and strengthen GRZ-Px8 and GRZ-Rx3.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted, although I do not recommend any amendments to strengthen the provisions.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054	S054.05	Jonas, Malu	General - Community Gardens and Allotments	Not specified	The submission seeks that the District Plan make provision for allotment sections and community gardens. The submission describes reasons in detail, which include: - This form of land use is increasingly valued worldwide in the face of increased population pressures, food insecurity and the loss of valuable food-producing land to urbanization. - Intensification may result in the effective loss of private gardens. - Kāpiti has good growing conditions and gardening is a popular pastime. - People who live in apartments or townhouses may also want to be engaged in local food growing initiatives. - Allotment systems are great at providing leased land plots on areas that are otherwise suitable for housing. - Land should be set aside by the Council for local community gardens; - Growing and disseminating fresh food locally is a vital community enhancing resource that needs to be prioritised. - Food growing supports local resilience.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to include a new objective and policy that provides for the following: 1. Leasehold Allotments on 'spare' sunny land (that is otherwise not fit for housing, abandoned, or possibly subject to weeds infestation and litter dumping) be developed and protected in every suburb, to facilitate community participation in gardening and local food production. 2. Sunny land be set aside at 1 -2 kilometre intervals for Community Gardens and Food Forests. This could involve: A. The Kapiti Coast District Council buys private sites as Public Works, and protect them from being 'built out' by height covenants on neighbouring sections and/or B. The Kapiti Coast District Council encourages and facilitates local initiatives to develop Community Gardens on 'public' land such as council berms. 3. The Kapiti Coast District Council prioritises the local production of food by community groups and individuals over other public amenity values e.g. Mowing council berms.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that the outcomes sought by the submitter can be effectively achieved through the District Plan. I consider that it would be more appropriate to address the matters raised by the submitter as part of the Council's Long-term Plan.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054	S054.06	Jonas, Malu	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	The submission states that it is clear and logical that high buildings will reduce sun falling on existing neighbouring buildings and land. There are no protections in PC2 to safeguard against the climate change and economic consequences of solar power generating systems having their sun reduced or blocked completely.  It is completely iniquitous that people who have prioritized low emissions and energy self-sufficiency in the interests of living responsibly on this planet, be penalized by neighbouring properties building out their sun. This is not just 'an amenity value'.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to require that any developed of a 3+ storey building that negatively impacts on a neighbour's existing solar power system compensate that negatively affected property in the following ways: A. Pay compensation for the value of the solar power generating and/or storage system to the owner of the negatively affected property and B. Install a solar power generating and storage system on their new high-rise building, and hook the negatively affected property up to their solar-generated electricity.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note the matters raised by the submitter, however I consider that the provisions sought would likely be complex and difficult to administer.  Notwithstanding this, I note that under proposed rule GRZ-Rx5, where a development breaches building height or height in relation to boundary standards, and where this is demonstrated to have adverse effects on existing solar power generating systems, these effects would be able to be taken into account by the Council when considering whether to grant or decline resource consent for the development, or impose conditions on the consent.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054	S054.07	Jonas, Malu	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	See submission point S054.06.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to prioritise urban intensification in areas that have the least impact on existing Solar Generation systems, and existing food production areas.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I understand that the submitter is primarily concerned with the effects of shading associated with development enabled by the MDRS or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, and the potential impacts of additional shading on existing solar generation systems and food production areas. While I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitter, I do not consider that either of these matters are justified as qualifying matters. In particular, it is unclear what areas or sites in the district this would be an issue in, and to what extent additional shading would be an issue in relation to the functionality of solar generation systems and food production areas.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054	S054.08	Jonas, Malu	General - Climate Change Mitigation and Ecological Protection	Not specified	PC2 does not include any safeguards for local mature trees, particularly exotic trees. Not only do mature trees provide shade and cooling canopies for humans in an increasingly warmer climate, but they provide food and shelter corridors for our birdlife.  Waikanae is renown for its mature trees, that provide a necessary ecological corridor between Kapiti Island and Hemi Matenga reserve.  PC2 does not provide any ecological protection for the ecosystems (i.e., the mature trees) that make up this vital bird corridor. It is well known that destroying corridors of food and shelter sources puts bird populations at risk of inbreeding and starvation.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to include a provision that protects the Waikanae ecological bird corridor between Kāpiti Island and Hemi Matenga, by making the removal of mature trees (including exotic trees) over 40cm in diameter a notifiable matter.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	While I acknowledge the matter raised by the submitter, I do not consider such a corridor is justified as a qualifying matter. In particular, I consider that ecological evidence would be required to justify where such a corridor should be located (including the identification of appropriate boundaries), and what District Plan provisions would be appropriate to manage development in any identified area.  I note however that there are several (over 300) individual trees located between the Hemi Matenga Memorial Park and the Waikanae River which are scheduled as "key indigenous trees" in Schedule 2 of the District Plan. These trees will continue to be protected as an existing qualifying matter under rule ECO-R7.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S054.08.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Climate Change Mitigation and Ecological Protection	Support primary submission	Seek an Amendment in PC2 that values Emissions Mitigation in the form of mature existing vegetation (both exotic and native) as well as Emissions Reduction. Seek an Amendment that requires the proposed removal of trees with trunk diameter of more than 25cm to be regarded as a Notifiable Matter.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S055	S055.01	McIntyre, Andrew	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S055.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S055.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, 9 flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S055	S055.02	McIntyre, Andrew	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S055.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S056	S056.01	Camp, Rod	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S056.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S056.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S056	S056.02	Camp, Rod	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S056.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S057	S057.01	Scholl, Stephan	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S057.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S057.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S057	S057.02	Scholl, Stephan	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S057.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S058	S058.01	Davis, Briony and Lloyd	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S058.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S058.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S058	S058.02	Davis, Briony and Lloyd	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S058.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S059	S059.01	Feast, Deborah	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S059.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S059.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S059	S059.02	Feast, Deborah	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S059.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S060	S060.01	Feast, John	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S060.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S060.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S060	S060.02	Feast, John	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S060.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S061	S061.01	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character". - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. - Appropriate Coastal Qualifying and Beach Residential Precincts would have an insignificant effect on intensification potential.	<b>Delete</b> the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct which is based on Section 6(a), and which has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend CE-R1 and CE-R2 (refer section 16.2 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S100.FS.1	S061.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S061.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree the most residents would consider allowing higher development along the Kāpiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. We agree that Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting that in our iwi perspective the coastline should all be consider 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We support the reference that it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.  The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S061	S061.02	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S061.01.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, <b>amend</b> Plan Change 2 to introduce consistent Qualifying Matter Precincts to address overland flow paths, flood hazards and ponding. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter D in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S061	S061.03	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S061.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S061	S061.04	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S061.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S061	S061.05	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - It is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Zones as they are impacted by any enlarged Coastal Qualifying Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct. - There is inconsistent treatment of Local Centres. - There has been no assessment of the need for the Local Centre at Te Moana in the view of the likely impact of the Local Centre at Ngarara. - Local centres and their surrounds have not been assessed as to their ability to absorb the effects they will be subject to, or whether the Local Centre is commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services, as required by policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PRECx2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S209.FS.1	S061.05.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209. Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth. The proposed 'bakery' area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S061	S061.06	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S061.05.	Further or alternatively, <b>rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S061	S061.07	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S061.05.	Alternatively, if submission S061.06 is not accepted, limit the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S061	S061.08	Dickson, Stuart and Fiona	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S061.05.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S062	S062.01	Pritchard, Mary	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S062.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S062.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S062	S062.02	Pritchard, Mary	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S062.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S063	S063.01	Pritchard, Stuart	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S063.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S063.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S063	S063.02	Pritchard, Stuart	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S063.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S064	S064.01	Milne, Philip	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission includes a detailed list of reasons. These include (but are not limited to): - Opposition to the use of the Jacobs 2 report as a basis for defining the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Refer also to the original submission for full list of reasons.	<b>Delete</b> the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S064.01.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S064	S064.02	Milne, Philip	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission includes a detailed list of reasons. These include (but are not limited to): - The Council has not recognised and provided for section 6(a) of the RMA, and the resulting policies of the NZCPS. - Providing for 3 story dwellings along most of the coastline and 6 story development at Paraparaumu Beach Village and elsewhere will result in inappropriate use and development of the coastal marine area and will fail to maintain (preserve) the remaining natural character of this iconic and defining part of the Kapiti Coast District. Refer also to the original submission for full list of reasons.	<b>Replace</b> the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct based on section 6(a), or require the Council to properly investigate a means of recognising and providing for section 6(a) and the subservient NZCPS policies and vary the Plan Change or change the District Plan to include such a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend CE-R1 and CE-R2 (refer section 16.2 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S186.FS.1	S064.02.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S064.02.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S064.02.FS03	Nga Hapu o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with the submitter that providing for 3 story dwellings along most of the coastline will fail to maintain (preserve) the remaining natural character of this iconic coast and culturally valuable ancestral landscape. They are of the opinion that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones are currently predicted to be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S064	S064.03	Milne, Philip	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission includes a detailed list of reasons. These include (but are not limited to): - It is unreasonable to include a tiny corner of this large property (127 Manly Street) in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Refer also to the original submission for full list of reasons.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, then <b>remove</b> the anomaly at 127 Manly Street.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I consider that the mapping of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not an anomaly, and is consistent with the approach to determining the spatial extent of the precinct described in section 6.1.3 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report.	Do not accept.	No.
S064	S064.04	Milne, Philip	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states that the Council's approach to the coastal erosion hazard is inconsistent with its approach to other natural hazards. The Council has created a proposed CQMP in the absence of any District Plan coastal erosion hazard identification. In contrast, the District Plan includes overlays for flooding, ponding and surface flow and associated restrictions on development, but the Council has not reflected those in corresponding exclusion areas.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, then <b>introduce</b> consistent qualifying matter precincts to deal with flood hazard and ponding areas shown in the District Plan.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter D in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S064	S064.05	Milne, Philip	Town Centre Zone	Oppose	Paraparaumu Beach shopping centre (which is regarded as the "village" centre) is not a "town centre" by nature, size or function. Rather it is a local centre.	<b>Rezone</b> the Paraparaumu Beach shopping area from Town Centre Zone to Local Centre Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	The submitter questions the application of the Town Centre Zone to Paraparaumu beach. PC(N) does not propose to change the centres hierarchy, or change the zoning of Metropolitan, Town and Local Centres zones that are part of the centres hierarchy. Rather, PC(N) gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD based on the Metropolitan, Town and Local Centre zones as they are in the operative District Plan. Therefore, I consider that it would not be appropriate to rezone the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone as Local Centre Zone, on the basis that this would be inconsistent with the District's centres hierarchy.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S064.05.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Town Centre Zone	Support primary submission	<i>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S064	S064.06	Milne, Philip	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	Permitting 6 story development around the existing local centre would compromise amenity values and be totally out of character with existing development, which with one very notable exception ...the tower block ...is 1 to 3 levels.  That height of development would be inappropriate use and development of the coastal environment. Kapiti Coast is not Surfers Paradise or the Mount and residents do not want this type of development because it would have significant adverse effects on coastal character and amenity values.	Consequential to S064.05, delete PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B from the General Residential Zone surrounding the Paraparaumu Beach shopping area.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area around the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S064.06.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Support primary submission	<i>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S064	S064.07	Milne, Philip	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	Kena Kena shopping area is a tiny village/local centre. There is no justification for including the area around the centre as PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B as shown. The same issues arise in relation to the Te Moana local centre. Neither of these areas are close to the railway station.	Delete the Kena Kena PRECx2 Residential Intensification Precinct B from the General Residential Zone surrounding the Kena Kena Local Centre Zone.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	In addition to the existing activities that occur there, the provisions of the Local Centre Zone at Kena Kena provide for the development of a range of commercial activities and community services to serve the needs of the local community, as a permitted activity. I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area around the Kena Kena Local Centre Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S160.FS.03	S064.FS.01	Gomez, Nancy	Full submission	Support primary submission	The submitter agrees with the points raised in the submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S065	S065.01	Woon, James	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S065.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S065.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with 12 reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S065	S065.02	Woon, James	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S065.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S066	S066.01	Bismark, Matthew	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S066.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S066.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S066	S066.02	Bismark, Matthew	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S066.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S067	S067.01	Manly Flats Limited	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission includes a detailed list of reasons. These include (but are not limited to): - Opposition to the use of the Jacobs 2 report as a basis for defining the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	Delete the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S067.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S067.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S067	S067.02	Manly Flats Limited	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission includes a detailed list of reasons. These include (but are not limited to): - The Council has not recognised and provided for section 6(a) of the RMA, and the resulting policies of the NZCPS. - Providing for 3 story dwellings along most of the coastline and 6 story development at Paraparaumu Beach Village and elsewhere will result in inappropriate use and development of the coastal marine area and will fail to maintain (preserve) the remaining natural character of this iconic and defining part of the Kapiti Coast District.	<b>Replace</b> the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct based on section 6(a), or require the Council to properly investigate a means of recognising and providing for section 6(a) and the subservient NZCPS policies and vary the Plan Change or change the District Plan to include such a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend CE-R1 and CE-R2 (refer section 16.2 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S067	S067.03	Manly Flats Limited	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission includes a detailed list of reasons. These include (but are not limited to): - It is unreasonable to include a tiny corner of this large property (127 Manly Street) in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, then <b>remove</b> the anomaly at 127 Manly Street.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I consider that the mapping of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not an anomaly, and is consistent with the approach to determining the spatial extent of the precinct described in section 6.1.3 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S067	S067.04	Manly Flats Limited	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states that the Council's approach to the coastal erosion hazard is inconsistent with its approach to other natural hazards. The Council has created a proposed CQMP in the absence of any District Plan coastal erosion hazard identification. In contrast, the District Plan includes overlays for flooding, ponding and surface flow and associated restrictions on development, but the Council has not reflected those in corresponding exclusion areas.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, then <b>introduce</b> consistent qualifying matter precincts to deal with flood hazard and ponding areas shown in the District Plan.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter D in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S067	S067.05	Manly Flats Limited	Town Centre Zone	Oppose	No specific reasons given.	<b>Rezone</b> the Paraparaumu Beach shopping area from Town Centre Zone to Local Centre Zone.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I do not consider that rezoning the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone to a Local Centre Zone is justified. I also note that this would be inconsistent with District's centres hierarchy outlined under policies MCZ-P4, TCZ-P2, LCZ-P2 and MUZ-P3.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S067	S067.06	Manly Flats Limited	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	No specific reasons given.	Consequential to S064.05, <b>delete</b> PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area around the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S067	S067.07	Manly Flats Limited	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	No specific reasons given.	<b>Delete</b> the Kena Kena PRECx2 Residential Intensification Precinct B.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	In addition to the existing activities that occur there, the provisions of the Local Centre Zone at Kena Kena provide for the development of a range of commercial activities and community services to serve the needs of the local community, as a permitted activity. I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area around the Kena Kena Local Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S160.FS.03	S067.FS.01	Gomez, Nancy	Full submission	Support primary submission	The submitter agrees with the points raised in the submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S068	S068.01	Carter, Anna and John	Waikanae North Development Area and 41 Morepork Drive, Waikanae	Not specified	The submission opposes the retention of the Waikanae North Development Area, the Precinct Plan (in particular the Open Space Precinct located over private land) and the Masterplan for the WND. The submission also opposes the failure to rezone land within the WND as General Residential Zone with appropriate precincts.  The submission identifies a range of reasons, including (but not limited to): - Rezoning of the area and land is consistent with Objective 3, Policy 3 and Clause 3.2 of the NPS-UD; - The Waikanae North Development Area should be considered an urban environment, and the Area should be zoned using a zone from the Zone Framework Standard of the National Planning Standards; - There are no qualifying matters that would exempt the site from the future urban zone; - The Masterplan and Precinct Plan associated with the Development Area are no longer relevant given the consented development approved under various resource consents; - The application of the Waikanae North Development Area provisions is an inefficient use of fully serviced urban land. - The submission includes an analysis that identifies that the Waikanae North Development Area and the land at 41 Morepork Drive meets the criteria set for rezoning in the Section 32 report, as well as a further analysis that concludes that the land is more suitable for rezoning to General Residential than many of the other areas identified for rezoning in the notified version of PC2.  The submission further identifies that there is potential to use the consented subdivision scheme plan for part of the land as a zoning outline should KCDC see the need to protect areas to be vested as reserve as Open Space Zone.	<b>Amend</b> the planning maps to remove the existing WND zoning and precincts including as shown in the Master Plan, the Precinct Plan, and the Regulatory Plan which includes a roading hierarchy over land within Waikanae North Development Area (WND) and within the land at 41 Morepork Drive, Waikanae; and <b>rezone</b> this land as General Residential Zone (GRZ) and provide for higher densities over the land identified in WND as Precinct 4 – Village and Precinct 5 – Multi Unit.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S068.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Waikanae North Development Area and 41 Morepork Drive, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission. SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first - to allow for much greater housing intensification - the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents - make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built) - reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station - when the railway line is further electrified to Otaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access - this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S068.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Waikanae North Development Area and 41 Morepork Drive, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpitī decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S068	S068.02	Carter, Anna and John	Waikanae North Development Area	Not specified	See submission point S068.01.	<b>Remove</b> all other provisions in the District Plan relating to the Waikanae North Development Area including the Waikanae North Design Guide and the associated Masterplan, Precinct Plan, and Regulatory Plan, the associated policies, rules and appendices/schedules.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054.FS.1	S068.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Waikanae North Development Area	Support primary submission	Support this submission. SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first - to allow for much greater housing intensification - the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents - make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built) - reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station - when the railway line is further electrified to Otaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access - this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S069	S069.01	Fiti, Faimasulu	GRZ-P3, GRZ-P4, GRZ-P5, GRZ-P6	Oppose	Concern about how property development will impact the character of a suburb.	<b>Reinstate</b> General Residential Zone Policy GRZ-P3 to retain Special Character Areas  <b>Retain</b> the General Residential Zone Policies GRZ-P4, GRZ-P5 and GRZ-P6 to retain character and unique qualities of suburbs such as Paekākāriki, Raumati South, Raumati Beach, and the Garden District of Waikanae.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that the operative policies associated with special character areas, including the Beach Residential Precincts and the Waikanae Garden Precinct, are consistent with the requirement for the District Plan to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I note that this matter is described in further detail on pages 170-172 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S070	S070.01	Brewerton, Paul	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S070.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S070.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S070	S070.02	Brewerton, Paul	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S070.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S071	S071.01	Juchnowicz (nee Devereux), Anne	20-24 Reikorangi Road, Waikanae	Not specified	This submission notes that the property at 20-24 Reikorangi Road, Waikanae, is not included in the proposed General Residential Rezone under PC2, but they are aware of neighbouring properties submitting that they would like to be included in the PC2 rezone. This submitter does not want the property at 20-24 Reikorangi Road, Waikanae, included in the rezone under PC2. For the following reasons: - The south-east boundary is shared with the Waikanae Water Treatment Plan (WWTP). Suggest that this property is used as a buffer between the WWTP and possible future residential areas, to minimise the impacts of: the bright night spotlight/security lights that shine across our land; the hum of the pumps; the weekly sessions of running the loud emergency generator; and the transfer (from trucks) and holding containers of powerfully toxic chemicals. - Within the property is an area of protected indigenous forest covered under the protection of the Queen Elizabeth II Covenant. Suggestion that continued protection is given with this land remaining rural, as compared to being rezoned to residential, wherein significantly greater foot damage would occur to the precious undergrowth of the forest, let alone the greater risk of introduction of disease to the heritage trees. - It is the rural setting here, the forest, river, the animals, herbal and vegetable gardens, as well as being in a supportive family community, that has made a profound impact for good on the people we support. These are spiritual, cultural, mental health, physical health dynamics, a sense of belonging/community treasures that we can continue to nourish within a rural context.	That this property <b>remain</b> classified as rural, exempt from any future proposed changes to General Residential zoning under the PC2 provisions, or under the Council Plan Change refining for 2024.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S054.FS.1	S071.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	20-24 Reikorangi Road, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission. This submitter could say the same about their own property and the people they support.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S072	S072.01	Wyatt, Warwick	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S072.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S072.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S072	S072.02	Wyatt, Warwick	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S072.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S073	S073.01	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	APPx2 - Centres Design Guide	Support	The Cancer Society support the rezoning of all areas listed to general residential zones with built and natural shade an integral part of any new development or neighbourhood.  The proposed Residential Design Guide and Centres Design Guide provide opportunities to enhance community wellbeing in the following ways: plan for the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in all new developments and provide additional recreation spaces in our communities. KCDC is also in a unique position to ensure that sun protection options are provided in all new housing developments and shared, outdoor public places, particularly with respect to shade, built and both planned and natural planted shade.  In recent years much effort has gone into encouraging personal sun safety behaviour, environmental protection in the form of shade has been a relatively neglected component of sun protection initiatives.  The Cancer Society applaud Kapiti Coast District Council for acknowledging the necessity of shade provision in planning guides.	<b>Retain</b> Centres Design Guide Section 6.3 Amenity and Sustainability as notified.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I agree with the submitter, although I note that recommendations to amend the Centres Design Guide are made in relation to other submission points.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting that recommendations to amend the Centres Design Guide are made in relation to other submission points.	<b>No.</b>
S073	S073.02	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support	See submission point S073.01.	<b>Retain</b> Residential Design Guide points 25, 65 and 76 as notified.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S073	S073.03	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support	The Cancer Society support: - improved connectivity and the opportunity for our communities to use active transport; - support improved shade provision (both built and natural) in local public spaces and town centres to make the commute healthier (in terms of UVR protection) and more attractive; - the provision for both built and natural shade at transport hubs to provide sun protection when waiting for public transport - the presence of trees encourages people to walk for both exercise and transport. This promotes physical and mental health wellbeing - adequate tree planting can help to cool urban areas, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, enhance the mauri of land and water, enhance biodiversity and improve human health and wellbeing.	<b>Retain</b> Design Principle that integrate with public realm and surrounds in the proposed Residential Design Guide as notified.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S073.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S073	S073.04	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support in part	The Cancer Society support design that caters to the needs of all in our rohe. Access to shade is an equity issue.	<b>Undertake</b> canopy mapping to enable priority planting programmes to increase shade provision in our lower socio-economic status Kāpiti neighbourhoods.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I acknowledge the matter raised by the submitter, I consider that the District Plan would not be an effective method to provide for canopy mapping and priority planting programmes. In my opinion, these are specific work programmes which would require planning and funding and as such, if they are considered to be desirable it would be more appropriate to provide for them through other mechanisms (such as the Long-term Plan) following appropriate consultation with the community, rather than through land-use regulation under the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S073.04.FS01	Jonas, Malu	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S073	S073.05	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Not specified	The Cancer Society recommend the use of deciduous trees for providing summer shade tree cover to ensure an adequate shade canopy in summer and lower temperatures around all buildings.	<b>Amend</b> point 25 of the Residential Design guide to specify deciduous trees.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I consider that the relief sought by the submitter is already provided for under guideline 65 of the Residential Design Guide.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S073.05.FS01	Jonas, Malu	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S073	S073.06	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Not specified	The Cancer Society recommend the measures outlined in section 6.3 Amenity and Sustainability and would like to see them stringently applied to Waikanae town centre and the Paraparaumu town centre.  The Cancer Society recommend the use of built and natural shade to reduce the urban heat island effect.	<b>Amend</b> Residential Design Guide Section 6.3 Amenity and Sustainability to recommend the use of built and natural shade to reduce the urban island effect.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The National Adaptation Plan defines urban heat islands as "urbanised areas that experience higher temperatures than outlying areas. Structures such as buildings, roads and other infrastructure absorb and re-emit the sun's heat more than natural landscapes such as forests and water bodies. Urban areas, where these structures are highly concentrated and greenery is limited, become 'islands' of higher temperatures relative to outlying areas." (Ministry for the Environment, 2022, p.187).  As I understand it (and based on this definition), the factors that contribute to the effect are derived from a broad range of sources over areas that are wider than those being managed by the Design Guides (this includes infrastructure as public roads, which are outside the scope of the Design Guides). While well intentioned, I consider that the urban heat island effect is too broad an issue to manage through the design guides. Notwithstanding this, I note that several of the guidelines in the Design Guides would be likely to contribute towards managing the effect, including guidelines that encourage natural and physical shading (guideline 25), guidelines that promote new vegetation and the retention of existing mature healthy vegetation (guidelines 61-65), and guidelines that promote the minimisation of impermeable surfaces (guideline 67).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S073.06.FS01	Jonas, Malu	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S073	S073.07	Cancer Society of NZ (Wellington Division)	General	Not specified	In any subdivisions, extension of an existing subdivision, or new development the Cancer Society strongly advises that the developer be required to include adequate tree planting and develop adequate green spaces. Trees make a further environmental contribution in subdivisions by reducing runoff volumes and delaying the onset of peak flows from rainfall. Trees create energy saving, plus aesthetic and air quality improvements.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to ensure any new subdivision that the developer be required to include adequate tree planting, adequate green spaces which include natural shade and seating.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	While I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitter, it not clear what would constitute "adequate" in relation to tree planting. In relation to the provision of green spaces, I consider the MDRS already sets expectations as to what is considered to be adequate, and provides for this under the land use rule GRZ-Rx1, which requires 20% of the developed site to be set aside as landscape area. In relation to natural shade and seating, I do not consider it appropriate to require these as standards, however I note that consideration of shading and seating for outdoor spaces is included in the Residential Design Guide (see guidelines 25 and 28) and the Centres Design Guides (see guidelines 26 and 30).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197.FS.1	S073.07.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General	Oppose primary submission	The RVA oppose this relief as it is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S229.FS.1	S073.07.FS02	Palmer, Viola	General	Support primary submission	Support the whole submission. Recommend planting native trees rather than exotic trees because they are more suited to the wet and windy climate. In addition to those mentioned above, trees and grass sequester carbon, they absorb pollutants, they support biodiversity, they absorb water and prevent slips, they dampen noise and they make a city aesthetically pleasing. With housing intensification trees and open spaces become even more important.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S231.FS.1	S073.07.FS03	Fleming, Jean	General	Support primary submission	Support the whole submission. Recommend planting native trees rather than exotic trees because they tend to be weedy and spread. Should aim to grow trees suitable for the local ecosystem. 1. Well-being and health: Health system is stretched. Climate change is here, associated with hotter days and a higher risk of exposure to UV. Every dwelling should have a large tree, if not five, nearby, to provide shade and green calm. 2. Transport changes: encouraging more people to walk and cycle to lower emissions, then trees provide the shade needed in a warming world. 3. Biodiversity: to increase numbers of native birds, we need to provide the habitat to encourage tui, korimako, kaka and ririro and have more bush and less open park and pasture land.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S073.07.FS04	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S073.07.FS05	Ryman Healthcare Limited	General	Oppose primary submission	Ryman oppose this relief as it is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act or the NPSUD.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S252.FS.1	S073.FS01	Low Carbon Kapiti	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support full submission. The carbon sequestration benefit of urban trees and the climate change adaptation benefit of additional shade. Tree cover will also encourage people to use active transport, which has emissions reduction benefit. LCK has a position on urban trees policy which can be found here: <a href="https://lowcarbonkapiti.org.nz/urban-trees-campaign/">https://lowcarbonkapiti.org.nz/urban-trees-campaign/</a>	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S074	S074.01	Hazelton, Andrew	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character". - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. - Appropriate Coastal Qualifying and Beach Residential Precincts would have an insignificant effect on intensification potential.	<b>Delete</b> the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct which is based on Section 6(a), and which has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend CE-R1 and CE-R2 (refer section 16.2 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S100.FS.1	S074.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S074.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitters agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps are areas that will likely be affected by coastal erosion, sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S074	S074.02	Hazelton, Andrew	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S074.01.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, <b>amend</b> Plan Change 2 to introduce consistent Qualifying Matter Precincts to address overland flow paths, flood hazards and ponding. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter D in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S074	S074.03	Hazelton, Andrew	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S074.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074	S074.04	Hazelton, Andrew	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S074.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074	S074.05	Hazelton, Andrew	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - It is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Zones as they are impacted by any enlarged Coastal Qualifying Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct. - There is inconsistent treatment of Local Centres. - There has been no assessment of the need for the Local Centre at Te Moana in the view of the likely impact of the Local Centre at Ngarara. - Local centres and their surrounds have not been assessed as to their ability to absorb the effects they will be subject to, or whether the Local Centre is commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services, as required by policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S209.FS.1	S074.05.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209. Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth. The proposed 'bakery' area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S074	S074.06	Hazelton, Andrew	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S074.05.	Further or alternatively, <b>rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074	S074.07	Hazelton, Andrew	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S074.05.	Alternatively, if submission S074.06 is not accepted, limit the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074	S074.08	Hazelton, Andrew	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S074.05.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S075	S075.01	Brain, Peter	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S075.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S075.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Submitter agrees that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. They agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer Maps show areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S075	S075.02	Brain, Peter	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S075.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S076	S076.01	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Definitions - 'Qualifying Matter Area'	Support	Transpower supports the definition of 'Qualifying Matter Area' on the basis that the definition includes the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor and these are qualifying matters because they are matters that are:  - required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); and - required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.	<b>Retain</b> the definition of 'Qualifying Matter Area' as notified.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S076	S076.02	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Definitions	Oppose	Given the role and importance of qualifying matter areas to the implementation of the RMA, and in order to support the definition of 'Qualifying Matter Areas' in the District Plan, Transpower seeks that the District Plan also include a definition of 'Qualifying Matter', noting the term is used within proposed policy GRZ-Px2.	<b>Add a definition of "Qualifying Matter" as follows:</b> <b>QUALIFYING MATTER</b> <b>has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA.</b> <b>means a matter referred to in section 771 or 770</b>  <b>The matters referred to in section 771 and 770 are listed below:</b>  <b>a. a matter of national importance that decision makers are required to recognise and provide for under section 6;</b> <b>b. a matter required in order to give effect to a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD) or the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010;</b> <b>c. a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure;</b> <b>d. open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space;</b> <b>e. the need to give effect to a designation or heritage order, but only in relation to land that is subject to the designation or heritage order;</b> <b>f. a matter necessary to implement, or to ensure consistency with, iwi participation legislations;</b> <b>g. the requirement in the NPS-UD to provide sufficient business land suitable for low density uses to meet expected demand;</b> <b>h. any other matter that makes higher density development as provided for by policy 3, as the case requires, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77R is satisfied/any other matter that makes higher density, as provided for by the MDRS or policy 3, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77L is satisfied.</b>	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I agree that it is appropriate to include a definition of <i>qualifying matter</i> in the District Plan on the basis that the term <i>qualifying matter</i> is used in the mandatory MDRS policy 2 (which is provided for as policy GRZ-Px2). Including a definition will improve interpretation of policy GRZ-Px2 by clarifying that the term <i>qualifying matters</i> used in the policy is a reference to the statutory term.  I do not consider it appropriate to include the generic list included under sections 771 or 770 as part of the definition, as I consider that the interpretation of the definition of qualifying matter under section 2 of the RMA requires sections 771 and 770 to be read in their entirety. This is particularly the case where a qualifying matter has not yet been incorporated into the District Plan in accordance with sections 771 and 770 (and the related sections) of the RMA.  However, I do consider it appropriate that the definition identifies that <i>qualifying matters</i> includes those matters outlined under the definition of "IDENTIFIED QUALIFYING MATTER" proposed by PC2, as these are matters that have already been incorporated into the District Plan (or are proposed to be incorporated by PC2), in accordance with sections 771 and 770 of the RMA.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Add a definition of <i>qualifying matter</i> , but include reference to the proposed definition of "IDENTIFIED QUALIFYING MATTER" in lieu of the generic list of matters outlined under sections 771 and 770 of the RMA.	<b>Yes.</b> Add a definition of "QUALIFYING MATTER". Refer to section 20.18 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more efficient interpretation of policy GRZ-Px2 by clarifying that the term <i>qualifying matter</i> used under the policy is a reference to the statutory term. Incorporating reference to the definition of "IDENTIFIED QUALIFYING MATTER" as part of the definition also improves interpretation of the District Plan, by clarifying to plan users those matters that have already been incorporated into the District Plan as qualifying matters.
S122.FS.1	S076.02.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definitions	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as it considers that it is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S076	S076.03	Transpower New Zealand Limited	DO-O3	Support in part	Transpower seeks limited amendments to DO-O3 to reflect the constraints of qualifying matters on the ability to enable more people and businesses to be located in some locations (Qualifying Matter Areas). Transpower proposes an additional sub-clause in clause (3) that better reflects the outcomes sought and direction given in higher order documents, including the NPS-UD and the NPSET.	<b>Amend Objective DO-O3 as follows:</b> ... <b>3. an urban environment that enables more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, parts of the urban environment;</b> <b>a. that are in or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; or</b> <b>b. that are well serviced by existing or planned public transport; or</b> <b>c. where there is high demand for housing or for business land relative to other areas within the urban environment;</b> <b>d. that are not qualifying matter areas.</b> ...	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I agree that it is appropriate to recognise that there may be constraints on development in areas where a qualifying matter applies. However, I recommend alternative wording to that sought by the submitter, to ensure consistency between the wording of the objective, and recommended amendments to policy UFD-Px (which provides for the same matter).	<b>Accept in part.</b> Using alternative wording to ensure consistency with UFD-Px.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend DO-O3. Refer to section 1.2 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for appropriate recognition of qualifying matters within DO-O3. I consider this better aligns with the objective with the ability to recognise and provide for qualifying matters under sections 771 and 770 of the RMA and Policy 4 of the NPS-UD.
S122.FS.1	S076.03.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O3	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as it considers that it is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S076	S076.04	Transpower New Zealand Limited	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Support in part	Transpower seeks amendments to the DO-O3 explanatory text to more clearly reflect the constraints of qualifying matters on the ability to enable more people and businesses to be located in some places.	<b>Amend Objective DO-O3 explanatory text as follows:</b> ... Achieving an urban form that balances the need to meet the many housing needs of the District's residents with the preservation recognition of valued character and the achievement of infrastructure integration efficiencies is an additional, complex challenge. For example, providing for smaller allotment sizes and more dense living environments can affect an area's underlying character; however, when these more intense environments are appropriately located within the wider urban context, they can increase efficiency outcomes of public and private investment in public transport networks, commercial areas, open spaces and other community facilities. The approach to managing these challenges is to:  * maintain the predominant low density character that defines the District's many communities, while targeting specific areas for either increased character protection, and (conversely) increased residential intensity (indicatively represented in DO-Figure 4); * enable more people to live within Kāpiti's existing urban environments, particularly where these are well connected to transport, infrastructure, commercial activities and community services; * recognise that some parts of the urban environment contain qualifying matters, including aspects of valued character that may be sensitive to increased density or height of development change, and where appropriate include provisions that seek to help manage this change, and * provide for selected greenfields development areas in a way that also reinforces overall compact urban form.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I agree that it is appropriate to recognise the provision for qualifying matters within the explanatory text to DO-O3.  However, I consider that the amended text requested by the submitter may be seen to conflate the concept of qualifying matters with that of character, and I do not consider this to be appropriate. I consider that it would be more appropriate to recognise the provision for qualifying matters under a separate bullet point using language consistent to that recommended for DO-O3 and UFD-Px1.	<b>Accept in part.</b> By recognising qualifying matters under a separate bullet point, using different language to that requested by the submitter.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the explanatory text to DO-O3. Refer to section 1.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for appropriate recognition of qualifying matters within the explanatory text to DO-O3. I consider this better aligns with the objective with the ability to recognise and provide for qualifying matters under sections 771 and 770 of the RMA and Policy 4 of the NPS-UD.
S076	S076.05	Transpower New Zealand Limited	DO-O3	Support in part	See submission point S076.03.	<b>Amend Objective DO-O3 as outlined in submission point S076.03, in all sections of the District Plan where this Objective is repeated.</b>	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Refer to my assessment under submission point S076.03.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend objective DO-O3 where it appears in the District Plan chapter specified under section 1.4 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the evaluation under submission point S076.03.
S076	S076.06	Transpower New Zealand Limited	DO-Ox1	Support	Transpower supports Objective DO-Ox1, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety.	<b>Retain as notified.</b>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.07	Transpower New Zealand Limited	DO-Ox1	Support	See submission point S076.06.	<b>Retain Objective DO-Ox1 in all sections of the District Plan where this Objective is repeated.</b>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.08	Transpower New Zealand Limited	UFD-Px	Support	This policy seeks that inappropriate buildings, activities, heights and densities within qualifying matter areas area avoided. Insofar as the policy relates to the National Grid, it is considered that UFD-Px give effects (in part) to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET.	<b>Retain Policy UFD-Px as notified.</b>	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted, however in response to submission point S207.03 I have recommended that the provision be amended so that the term "avoid" is not used, as it may be seen to inappropriately override existing District Plan policies that identify how development should be managed in areas subject to an identified qualifying matter.  I note that existing District Plan policies INF-GEN-P2 and INF-MENU-P27, which seek to avoid inappropriate subdivision, use and development in relation to the national grid, will continue to apply.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting that I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S076	S076.09	Transpower New Zealand Limited	UFD-P1	Support in part	Seeks limited amendments to reflect the constraints of qualifying matters on the ability to provide increased housing densities. Transpower suggests an additional subclause that better reflects the outcomes sought and direction given in higher order documents, including the NPS-UD and the NPSET.	<b>Amend</b> Policy UFD-P1 as follows: <u>New urban development for residential activities will only be located within existing urban areas and identified growth areas, and will be undertaken in a manner which:</u>  1. supports the District's consolidated urban form; 2. maintains the integrity of the urban edge north of Waikanae and Ōtaki; 3. manages residential densities by: a. <u>enabling medium density housing and focused infill housing in identified precinct areas that are close to centres, public open spaces, and public transport nodes;</u> b. <u>retaining a predominantly low residential density in the Residential Zones;</u> c. <u>avoiding any significant adverse effects of subdivision and development in special character areas identified in GRZ-P3;</u> a. <u>providing for a variety of housing types and densities in the General Residential Zone;</u> b. <u>enabling increased housing densities;</u> i. <u>in, and within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone;</u> ii. <u>within a walkable catchment of the train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae; and</u> iii. <u>in and adjacent to the Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone;</u> c. <u>avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities in qualifying matter areas.</u> 4. avoids urban expansion that would compromise the distinctiveness of existing settlements and unique character values in the rural environment between and around settlements; 5. can be sustained within and makes efficient use of existing capacity of public services and strategic infrastructure, or is integrated with the planned capacity of public services and infrastructure; and 6. promotes the efficient use of energy and water.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I consider that this matter is already appropriately addressed under policy UFD Px.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S076.09.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P1	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as the relief sought is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan. Kāinga Ora also opposes the use of the word 'avoid' in a policy that seeks to enable urban development. It is also noted that the proposed amendment refers to qualifying matters in general, whereas not all qualifying matters seek to limit height and density.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S076	S076.10	Transpower New Zealand Limited	INF-MENU-R30	Support	Acknowledges and supports the notification of Rule INF-MENU-R30 in the Proposed Plan Change as an existing qualifying matter in accordance with ss77K(1)(e) and/or 77Q(1)(e) of the RMA.	<b>Retain</b> Rule INF-MENU-R30 as an existing qualifying matter as notified.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.11	Transpower New Zealand Limited	INF-MENU-R31	Support	Acknowledges and supports the notification of Rule INF-MENU-R31 in the Proposed Plan Change as an existing qualifying matter in accordance with ss77K(1)(e) and/or 77Q(1)(e) of the RMA.	<b>Retain</b> Rule INF-MENU-R31 as an existing qualifying matter as notified.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.12	Transpower New Zealand Limited	INF-MENU-R38	Support	Acknowledges and supports the notification of Rule INF-MENU-R38 in the Proposed Plan Change as an existing qualifying matter in accordance with ss77K(1)(e) and/or 77Q(1)(e) of the RMA. While rule INF-MENU-R32 (National Grid Developed Area) is not including within the IPI as an existing qualifying matter, on the basis residential buildings (sensitive activities) within the National Grid Developed Area are not permitted under the rule, are managed under INF-MENU-R30, and are a non-complying activity under INF-MENU-R38, Transpower supports the IPI as notified in respect of the National Grid specific INF-MENU rules.	<b>Retain</b> Rule INF-MENU-R38 as an existing qualifying matter as notified.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.13	Transpower New Zealand Limited	SUB-DW-R14	Support	Acknowledges and supports the notification of Rule SUB-DW-R14 in the Proposed Plan Change as an existing qualifying matter in accordance with ss77K(1)(e) and/or 77Q(1)(e) of the RMA.	<b>Retain</b> Rule SUB-DW-R14 as an existing qualifying matter as notified.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.14	Transpower New Zealand Limited	SUB-DW-R22	Support	Acknowledges and supports the notification of Rule SUB-DW-R22 in the Proposed Plan Change as an existing qualifying matter in accordance with ss77K(1)(e) and/or 77Q(1)(e) of the RMA.	<b>Retain</b> Rule SUB-DW-R22 as an existing qualifying matter as notified.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S076	S076.15	Transpower New Zealand Limited	General Residential Zone: Introduction	Support in part	Transpower considers that the introduction would benefit from the inclusion of reference to the constraints imposed by qualifying matters, such as the National Grid. Transpower seeks the inclusion of a further clause to address this.	<b>Amend</b> the General Residential Zone introductory text as follows:  ... <u>The General Residential Zone contributes to the development of a well-functioning urban environment by enabling a variety of housing types and sizes that will provide a greater diversity of housing options for the city. The provisions of this zone incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards (the MDRS) and give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (the NPS-UD).</u> <u>A mix of housing densities are provided for throughout the Zone, with higher densities enabled in areas that are well served by public transport or are close to a range of commercial activities and community services. Housing types anticipated in the Zone include detached housing, semi-detached housing, terrace housing, low-rise apartments, and in some areas mid-rise apartments.</u> <u>The development of papakāinga is also provided for within the Zone. The Zone does not promote one form of housing over another but instead provides flexibility to meet the community's diverse housing needs, while recognising that there are parts of the Zone where the permitted development height and density may be modified or limited by qualifying matters.</u> <u>It is anticipated that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the Zone will change over time. Design guidelines help manage this change by promoting a high standard of urban design and encouraging new development to contribute positively to the changing character of the Zone.</u> <u>The following precincts are used to recognise or provide for a range of specific matters throughout the Zone, ...</u>	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I agree with the submitter that including a reference to the constraints associated with qualifying matters in the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter would improve interpretation of chapter.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the introductory text to the General Residential Zone chapter introduction. Refer to section 4.1 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for appropriate recognition of qualifying matters within the introductory text to the General Residential Zone chapter. I consider this better aligns with the objective with the ability to recognise and provide for qualifying matters under sections 771 and 770 of the RMA and Policy 4 of the NPS-UD.
S076	S076.16	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-Px1	Support in part	Within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within Policy GRZ-Px1 is supported (and reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(2)(a) of the RMA), Transpower supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.	<b>Amend</b> policy GRZ-Px1 as follows:  <u>Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the Zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying area provisions.</u>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S076.16.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Px1	Support primary submission	Support the reasoning and relief sought in this submission point. Submitters reasons make it clear the qualifying matter areas may impact upon the ability to provide up to 3-storey dwellings in Kapiti and this should be reflected in the policies.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S076.16.FS02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-Px1	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as the relief sought is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan. Kāinga Ora also opposes the use of the word 'avoid' in a policy that seeks to enable urban development. It is also noted that the proposed amendment refers to qualifying matters in general, whereas not all qualifying matters seek to limit height and density.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S076	S076.17	Transpower New Zealand Limited	GRZ-Px2	Support	Transpower supports GRZ-Px2 (noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the RMA) on the basis that it recognises qualifying matters.	<b>Retain</b> Policy GRZ-Px2 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S076	S076.18	Transpower New Zealand Limited	112 Ngarara Road, Waikanae; 211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose	<p>The proposed plan change seeks to amend the Zone of two areas of land that are traversed by the National Grid from Future Urban to General Residential Zone (refer to map pp24 of full Transpower New Zealand Limited submission document).</p> <p>This map shows the areas proposed to be rezoned with the Bunnythorpe to Haywood's 220kV A and B transmission lines shown in black lines.</p> <p>Transpower does not support the new General Residential Zone as notified where it intersects with the National Grid Yard. Transpower considers that rezoning land in the vicinity of the National Grid for urban and land uses:</p> <p>a. may give rise to a misleading or unreasonable expectation in respect of the development capacity or 'yield' of the site with reference to the District Plan rules and other regulations in NZECP34 and the Public Works Act;</p> <p>b. does not recognise that the National Grid is a qualifying matter and therefore the development capacity and density is limited with intensification restricted.</p> <p>c. does not give effect to the NPSET on the basis that:</p> <p>i. it is reasonably possible to manage activities that may compromise the National Grid through a consideration of zoning; and</p> <p>ii. zoning is a planning tool available to local authorities to signal areas within which sensitive activities will generally not be provided for.</p> <p>d. does not represent an efficient, effective or appropriate approach to achieving objectives; and therefore</p> <p>e. does not achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Transpower considers that it would be efficient, effective and appropriate to amend the proposed Zone boundaries so that the General Residential Zone does not extend into the area that intersects with the National Grid Yard.</p>	Amend the Planning Map so that the proposed General Residential Zone at 211 Ngarara Road and 112 Ngarara Road, does not extend into the areas that intersect with the National Grid Yard.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	<p>The submitter requests that the National Grid Yard is excluded from the proposed rezoning of these sites.</p> <p>Firstly, the District Plan already restricts development within the National Grid Yard, regardless of zone. This is a non-complying activity under rule INF-MENU-R38. Even where a site is zoned General Residential Zone, development in the National Grid Yard is subject to that rule.</p> <p>Given the issue is already managed through rules related to the National Grid, I consider it would be inappropriate to remove the National Grid Yard from the General Residential Zone as this would result in a non-cohesive zoning pattern.</p> <p>Regarding 112 Ngarara Road, the National Grid Yard does not cover the majority of the site, and there is sufficient developable area outside the National Grid Yard to provide for residential development.</p>	Do not accept.	No.
S224.FS.1	S076.18.FS01	Simpson, Vanessa and Guy	112 Ngarara Road, Waikanae; 211 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	<p>Oppose the submission from Transpower which proposes that the General Residential zoning should not extend into the area that intersects with the National Grid Yard. Transpower's opposition only relates to the very small (comparative) area of this submitters property that falls within the National Grid Yard.</p> <p>- The current Future Urban Zoning is not longer appropriate;</p> <p>- The National Grid Yard is already effectively and adequately protected via other legislation/regulations including it being a Qualifying Matter;</p> <p>- It doesn't make sense to rezone the National Grid Yard anything but the same as the balance of the property. This way the National Grid Yard provisions can be considered with and comprehensively developed into any future subdivision.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S077	S077.01	Francis Holdings Ltd.	58 Ruahine Street, Paraparaumu	Support	<p>Francis Holdings Ltd own land at 58 Ruahine Street Paraparaumu. The land is a rectangular block of land of 3.81 hectares on the eastern side of Ruahine Street.</p> <p>The land is currently zoned Rural Production Zone because it was previously associated with the nearby quarry. The land is now in separate ownership from the quarry and Plan Change 2 proposes to change the zone of the land to General Residential Zone.</p>	Approve the proposed rezoning of 58 Ruahine Street from Rural Production Zone to General Residential Zone as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S077	S077.02	Francis Holdings Ltd.	76 Ruahine Street, Paraparaumu	Not specified	76 Ruahine Street has similar characteristics and development potential to 58 Ruahine Street and has the potential to be integrated into a comprehensive development of that land. It is noted that eastern parts of both sites are subject to the Special Amenity Landscape Overlay.	Amend the proposed rezoning of 58 Ruahine Street to include the adjacent area of land at 76 Ruahine Street, as identified in the original submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	<p>The submitter requests 76 Ruahine Street be included in the rezoning proposed for 58 Ruahine Street to become General Residential Zone. The site is directly adjacent, and largely subject to the same constraints as 58 Ruahine Street. Additional constraints affecting 76 Ruahine Street include a flood/stream corridor, and a flood ponding area. These additional constraints are managed by the existing District Plan provisions. As a further submission notes, the site is adjacent to a former quarry, although any contamination issues are managed by the National Environmental Standard for Contaminated Land.</p> <p>Regarding the potential for reverse sensitivity effects associated with rezoning land directly adjacent to General Industrial zoned land, the General Industrial Zone has a suite of provisions which manage this. The land adjacent to 76 Ruahine Street is also subject to a structure plan which manages any existing and future reverse sensitivity effects, and the structure plan map does not indicate any existing sensitive activities at the boundary adjoining 76 Ruahine Street.</p> <p>Therefore, I consider it appropriate to extend the rezoning of 58 Ruahine Street under PC(N) to include 76 Ruahine Street.</p>	Accept.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.12 and Appendix F of PC(R1).</p> <p><b>Section 32AA evaluation</b></p> <p>I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because the inclusion of this site enables further residential density and is adjacent to land proposed to be rezoned. This rezoning supports incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan.</p>
S100.FS.1	S077.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	76 Ruahine Street, Paraparaumu	Oppose primary submission	<p>This site is adjacent to a quarry with a history of pollution. It should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2.</p> <p>KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.</p> <p>Retain existing zoning.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S077	S077.03	Francis Holdings Ltd.	58 & 76 Ruahine Street, Paraparaumu	Not specified	<p>Parts of both sites are within 800 m walking distance of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and therefore qualify under the NPS UD. Even if this is disputed the 800 m requirement is not a maximum, it is a minimum.</p> <p>Furthermore, as the sites are elevated and remote from any residential neighbours there is opportunity for a comprehensive medium to high density development that blends with the hill backdrop landscape and utilises building height and form to provide a high-quality development.</p> <p>As a currently greenfield site with excellent accessibility both to the metropolitan centre and rapid transit rail services it provides superior development opportunity than redevelopment within existing residential areas included in Precinct A.</p>	Amend the boundary of PREC1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A to include the land at 58 and 76 Ruahine Street (submission points S077.01 and S077.02).	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The significant majority of the site is not located within the walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and extending the Residential Intensification Precinct to incorporate it into the precinct would result in a non-cohesive boundary to the precinct at Ruahine and Rimutaka street.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S077.03.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	58 & 76 Ruahine Street, Paraparaumu	Oppose primary submission	<p>This site is adjacent to a quarry with a history of pollution. It should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2.</p> <p>KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.</p> <p>Retain existing zoning.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S232.FS.1	S077.FS01	Footo, Jacinda; Thomson, Daniel	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support the submission to rezone 58 and 76 Ruahine Street, Paraparaumu from Rural to Residential. The land is currently zoned Rural Production Zone because it was previously associated with the nearby quarry. The land is now in separate ownership from the quarry and Plan Change 2 proposes to change the zone of the land to General Residential Zone. 76 Ruahine Street has similar characteristics and development potential to 58 Ruahine Street and has the potential to be integrated into a comprehensive development of that land. It is noted that eastern parts of both sites are subject to the Special Amenity Landscape Overlay. Parts of both sites are within 800m walking distance of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and therefore qualify under the NPS UD. Even if this is disputed the 800m requirement is not a maximum, it is a minimum. Furthermore, as the sites are elevated and remote from any residential neighbours there is opportunity for a comprehensive medium to high density development that blends with the hill backdrop landscape and utilises building height and form to provide a high quality development. As a currently greenfield site with excellent accessibility both to the metropolitan centre and rapid transit rail services it provides superior development opportunity than redevelopment within existing residential areas included in Precinct A.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S078	S078.01	Lynch, Winifred and Bruce	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S078.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S078.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones that our Coastal 14 Environment areas will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S078	S078.02	Lynch, Winifred and Bruce	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	If submission S078.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S078.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones that our Coastal Environment areas will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S078	S078.03	Lynch, Winifred and Bruce	PRECx3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S078.01 and S078.02.	Amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S078	S078.04	Lynch, Winifred and Bruce	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S078.01 and S078.02.	Amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S079	S079.01	Halliburton, Barbara	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Oppose	This submission notes it is unclear whether the neighbouring properties of 96 Old Main Road, Raumati would be able to be developed to 6 or 12 storey. The submitter opposes either of these two height rules, due to not wanting to be overlooked.	Amend the provisions allowing for 6 or 12 storeys on neighbouring properties to 96 Old Main Road, Raumati, to a maximum of 4 storeys.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	96 Main Road, Raumati, is located in Residential Intensification Precinct A, which enables the development of residential buildings up to (and including) 6 storeys in height. 96 Main Road is located within the 800 metre walkable catchment of the edge of the Paraparaumu Metropolitan Centre Zone.  I do not consider it appropriate to amend the provisions of PC2 in the manner requested by the submitter, as this would be contrary to Policy 3(c)(iii) of the NPS-UD, which requires that the District Plan enables buildings of at least 6 storeys within a walkable catchment of the edge of the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S222.FS.1	S079.01.FS01	Turner, Paul	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support primary submission	This submission supports the submission that any new building at 96-114 Main Road South should not exceed four storeys. Concerns regarding the character of the neighbourhood and new developments not blending in with existing surroundings.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S079.FS.1	S079.01.FS02	Halliburton, Barbara	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support primary submission	This submission supports submission number S079.01. Any new building should not exceed 4 storeys.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S223.FS.1	S079.01.FS03	de Jongh, Barbara Joyce	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support primary submission	Support the submission to change the proposed rules for 96 and 98 Main Road South and to limit the height of proposed buildings to no more than 4 storeys. Concerns regarding privacy, noise, sunlight. Not opposed to development of the site, but wish to see the height of proposed new dwellings along the east/west boundary capped at no more than four storeys, and not sited within several metres of the boundary. Ideally the trees will also be retained to provide a visual and sound barrier for residents on both sides of the boundary.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S228.FS.1	S079.01.FS04	Terry, Grace Merilyn	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support primary submission	Object to the proposal allowing 6 storeys along Old Main Road between Raumati Road and the railway station. 3-4 storeys would be more acceptable. Concerns regarding privacy, noise, outlook, sunlight, loss of character, infrastructure provisions, lack of community services, and decrease of building standards.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S080	S080.01	Mealings, Marion	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S080.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S080.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S080	S080.02	Mealings, Marion	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S080.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S080.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S081	S081.01	Mealings, Michael	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S081.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S081.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S081	S081.02	Mealings, Michael	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S081.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S082	S082.01	Paekākāriki Housing Trust	Paekākāriki	Support in part	The PHT supports intensification to reduce cost of housing and protect the environment. However PHT submits that Paekākāriki is a suburban village, not a town centre. The proposed changes would have an impact on the liveability and wellbeing of the Paekākāriki community. There are not sufficient services to provide for the needs of a significantly increased population of Paekākāriki and the lack of infrastructure in Paekākāriki cannot be relied on to protect the village from the impact of the proposed changes.  Paekākāriki has minimal services: no medical centre, pharmacy, supermarket, community services, petrol station, minimal retail and a volunteer-only fire service.  Currently residents need to travel 12km, generally by car, to the supermarket and other retail outlets.	<b>Amend</b> the intensification proposal to a well-managed 3-storey intensification with more intensive options limited to immediately adjacent to the railway station and village centre.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested would be inconsistent with the requirement for the District Plan to give effect to Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD, which requires the District Plan to enable building heights of at least 6-storeys in a walkable catchment of the Paekākāriki train station (not just in areas immediately adjacent to the station).	Do not accept.	No.
S082	S082.02	Paekākāriki Housing Trust	Paekākāriki	Not specified	See submission point S082.01.	<b>Seek further advice</b> on whether there are grounds under qualifying matters that fit the Paekākāriki situation and reporting it as a qualifying matter for the independent panel to consider in line with Porirua City Council (PCC). PCC excluded Paremata and Pukerua Bay (both serviced by rapid transit services) under Policy 4 qualifying criteria (d) and (h) and included addition criteria relating to walkable access to a supermarket, primary school and open space.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to whether access to commercial activities and community services (such as those mentioned in the submission) and access to open spaces are qualifying matters, I note that these matters are not specifically provided for as qualifying matters under the NPS-UD or the RMA. In my opinion, providing for these matters as qualifying matters at Paekākāriki would not be consistent with Objective 3(b) of the NPS-UD, because Paekākāriki is serviced by a rapid transit stop, and Objective 3(b) seeks that the District Plan enable more people to live in, and more business and community services to be located in, areas that are well serviced by existing or planned public transport. While I acknowledge that residents may use private vehicles to access commercial activities and community services located outside of Paekākāriki, because the area is serviced by a rapid transit stop, public transport can also be used to access a range of commercial activities and community services.  While "open space for public use, but only in relation to the land that is open space" is provided for as a qualifying matter under both the NPS-UD and the RMA, I do not consider that this provides for residential zoned land with low proximity to open space to be considered as a qualifying matter, because I consider that this qualifying matter is intended to provide for the land that is open space only. In any case, I am not aware that access to open space at Paekākāriki is an issue (particularly given that the area has access to open space along the coastal margin).  I also note that the range of commercial activities and community services identified in the submission can be established as a permitted activity in the Local Centre Zone at Paekākāriki, subject to compliance with permitted activity standards. In addition to this, activities that are community facilities (such as medical centres or other community services) could be established as a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone, subject to compliance with permitted activity standards for community facilities.	Do not accept.	No.
S083	S083.01	Bevin, Helen	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S083.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarangotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S083.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S083	S083.02	Bevin, Helen	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S083.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S084	S084.01	Bevin, Thomas	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S084.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Atiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S084.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S084	S084.02	Bevin, Thomas	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S084.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S085	S085.01	Friends of Lake Karuwha	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	This submission opposes the boundary of the Residential Intensification Precinct B for the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre, for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Development has been limited in the existing "Ōtaki Low Density Housing Precinct" due to the location of the area on the urban edge and surface water management constraints. - It is a coherent and supportive community, with a single access point by one street from the higher lying area around Lupin Road. Walkways and areas of bush are significant features, and are enjoyed not only by residents of the community and those who come from further afield. - The subdivision as created as a "green oasis". Residents have added to the extensive plantings, greatly increasing biodiversity and encouraging an increase in native birdlife. - Residents support the sense of community for everyone here, through shared pest control measures, stream care, regular meetings and the formation of a community group - the "Friends of Lake Karuwha".  The Appendix E annotation with regard to the northeast boundary of PREC2, adding nine properties from the southwest side of Tamihana Street to the Residential Intensification Precinct B, states that this will "ensure a rational boundary". The submission states that this is not rational, because: • It means that a larger degree of intensification will apply to only one side (the southwest) of Tamihana Street when this is part of the coherent community referred to. Maintaining the • Under Step 3, part 3, of the Methodology referred to in Appendix E, "Where the walkable catchment covers a significant majority of an urban block, the intensification area would be expanded to cover the full extent of the block". This recognises that it makes sense to treat coherent communities as a whole when implementing a policy. • None of the properties from 4 to 20 Tamihana Street are within 400 m walking distance of the edge of the Ōtaki Town Centre. • The intensification area is being proposed to include properties on Tamihana Street located to the east of Open Space corresponding to a stream. This is inconsistent with Step 3, part 4 which states that: "... it may be appropriate to exclude properties that are otherwise located within a walkable catchment on the basis that there are only a small number of properties; and they are separated from the remainder of the intensification area by a feature such as a road, open space or river." The properties from 4 to 20 Tamihana Street are not only outside the walkable catchment, but inappropriately "connected" to the intensification area to the west across that stream and Open Space.	This submission proposes <b>amending</b> the north-east boundary of PREC2 to follow the actual 400m walkable catchment in that area, and in effect be aligned with the southwest boundary of the current PREC13 Ōtaki Low Density Housing Precinct (proposed to be deleted as part of this Plan Change). This would remove properties at 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 Tamihana Street from Residential Intensification Precinct B.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.9 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S203.FS.1	S085.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Support primary submission	NHOo opposes the walkable catchment areas in Ōtaki as there is insufficient evidence of a need and it is unlikely to increase the yield.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S086	S086.01	Houston, David	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S086	S086.02	Houston, David	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level rise and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	If submission S086.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S086.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S086.02.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S086	S086.03	Houston, David	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S086.01 and S086.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S086	S086.04	Houston, David	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S086.01 and S086.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S086	S086.05	Houston, David	Olde Beach Area	Not specified	See submission points S086.01 and S086.02.	Retain the Olde Beach area as a special residential zone.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I understand the reference to the 'Olde Beach area' is reference to a part of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct. Refer to the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S087	S087.01	Waikanae East Landowners	Land located between Waikanae River and Elizabeth Street	Not specified	The submission opposes PC2 in its current format. The submission identifies several reasons why rezoning of the land would be appropriate, including (but not limited to): - The submission includes an analysis that identifies that rezoning of the land would be consistent with the criteria for rezoning used in the S32 Report. - The submission includes a further analysis as to why rezoning of the area would be more appropriate than other areas identified for rezoning as part of PC2. - The land has been identified as a priority for rezoning in the Council's Growth Strategy. - Rezoning of the area could achieve 480 or more dwellings. - Suitable road connections can be achieved through incorporating new road connections into the District Plan. - Other matters, such as servicing of the site with three waters infrastructure, treatment of stormwater, provision of reserves and open space can all be achieved through the rules and matters of discretion contained in PC2 and the operative plan.  The submission also includes an appendix related to 12 Reikorangi Road within the area. This identifies that: - Rezoning of the land would give effect to policy 2 of the NPS-UD. - Not rezoning the land would likely result in further fragmentation of the land into lifestyle blocks. - The site meets the definition of being infrastructure-ready under the NPS-UD because it has access to network and transportation infrastructure. - There is no indication that development of the site would not be feasible or realisable. - There are no qualifying matters that would preclude the rezoning of the land to General Residential Zone.	Rezoned approximately 40 hectares of land between the Waikanae River and Elizabeth Street (as identified in Figure 2 of the submission) from General Rural Zone (Rural Plains Precinct) to General Residential Zone (part PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A). Make provision in the network hierarchy map of the ePlan to provide for new connections from Anne Street, Elizabeth Street and/or Reikorangi Road.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S053.FS.1	S087.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Land located between Waikanae River and Elizabeth Street	Oppose primary submission	The greenfield development proposed is located away from existing centre zones, employment opportunities and accessibility to public and active transport modes meaning that the development of this area has the potential to result in an isolated, low density urban settlement.  Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.	Disallow primary submission point. Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S054.FS.1	S087.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Land located between Waikanae River and Elizabeth Street	Oppose primary submission	Submission shows no understanding or concern for the local existing health and safety conditions in Waikanae East. This submission assumes that because roads exist in Waikanae East they are usable at all times and able to accommodate considerable population increase. Their land could offer great opportunities for new housing development, but this should only occur after the East-West connectivity issues between Waikanae East and the rest of the Kapiti Coast have been vastly improved. Suggest that the re-zoning of S047.01 and S087.01 be delayed until after Waikanae North has been re-zoned and developed, and a new school built in Waikanae North.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S100.FS.1	S087.01.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Land located between Waikanae River and Elizabeth Street	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S088	S088.01	Wakapua Farm Limited	Land within and near the Otaki Future Urban Zone	Not specified	The submission states that the criteria used for identifying land to be rezoned as part of PC2 are unjustifiably narrow. If a more detailed or comprehensive approach is required, an indicative structure plan/spatial tools can be readily produced as part of the hearing process for PC2.  Rezoning the land to be more enabling of residential use: - better implements the NPS-UD; - better implements District Objectives DO-O3, DO-O11, DO-Ox1 and DO-Ox2; - better implements other relevant provisions, including UDF-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P4, and UFD-Px; - makes effective use of the MDRS to enable increased housing supply and choice in the Kāpiti Coast District; - better achieves the sustainable management purposes of the RMA.	<b>Rezone</b> the land within and near to the Otaki Future Urban Zone (as identified in figure 1 of the submission from Future Urban Zone and General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S053.FS.1	S088.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Land within and near the Otaki Future Urban Zone	Oppose primary submission	<i>The greenfield development proposed is located away from existing centre zones, employment opportunities and accessibility to public and active transport modes meaning that the development of this area has the potential to result in an isolated, low density urban settlement.</i>  <i>Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i> <i>Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.</i>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S088.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Land within and near the Otaki Future Urban Zone	Oppose primary submission	<i>There is an old pa site on this land. The bones uplifted nearby during the new motorway makes this a culturally significant and heritage site. Major opposition to this area being rezoned. The proposed area may also include Māori lands and to our knowledge those owners have not been approached.</i> • Thorough site specific investigation is imperative before any rezoning • Govt and council intent of the NPS-UD is for growth in current residential urban areas • Some zones under TOW claims. TOW hearings are occurring in this area now. This rezoning may comprise or unfairly render land unavailable for TOW settlements. Allowing intensification is out of step with TOW process. No driver to rush the future growth areas so is inappropriate. • Flooding zones • Lack of infrastructure and distance to supermarkets and other facilities • Old pa sites (not yet formally identified wahi tapu) • Pop predictions and specialist reports do not give evidence of 'need' or likely occurrence of the level of intensification that is being enabled.... No driver to rush the future growth areas so is inappropriate. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S088	S088.02	Wakapua Farm Limited	Otaki Future Urban Zone	Not specified	To enable integrated planning and infrastructure servicing. See also submission point S088.01.	<b>Rezone</b> the balance of land within the Otaki Future Urban Zone from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S203.FS.1	S088.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Otaki Future Urban Zone	Oppose primary submission	<i>Thorough site specific investigation is imperative before any rezoning. Govt and council intent of the NPS-UD is for growth in current residential urban areas. Lack of infrastructure and distance to supermarkets and other facilities. Some areas maybe subject to TOW claims. TOW hearings are occurring in this area now. This rezoning may comprise or unfairly render land unavailable for TOW settlements. Allowing intensification is out of step with TOW process. No driver to rush the future growth areas so is inappropriate. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S089	S089.01	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	DO-O3	Support	FENZ supports DO-O3 insofar as it promotes the development of new urban areas where these can be efficiently serviced.	<b>Retain</b> as drafted.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to DO-O3 in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S089.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-O3	Support primary submission	<i>Support this submission.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S089	S089.02	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	DO-Ox1	Support	FENZ supports DO-Ox1 insofar as it promotes well-functioning urban environments that provides for the safety of people and communities.	<b>Retain</b> as drafted.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S089.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-Ox1	Support primary submission	<i>Support this submission.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S089	S089.03	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	UFD-P1	Support	FENZ supports UFD-P1 insofar as it promotes the urban development to occur in a manner which can be sustained within, and make efficient use of, public services and infrastructure.	<b>Retain</b> as drafted.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S089.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	<i>Support this submission.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S089	S089.04	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	UFD-P4	Support	FENZ supports UFD-P4 insofar as it ensures residential densities will be integrated with existing or planned infrastructure.	<b>Retain</b> as drafted.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.05	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	PK-Px4	Support	FENZ supports PK-Px4 insofar as it limits the maximum intensity and scale of development by the provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure to service papakāinga development.	<b>Retain</b> as drafted.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that I recommend a minor amendment to this policy in response to a submission from Waka Kōtahi [S053.06].	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting recommendations to amend this provision through other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.06	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ	Not specified	FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the General Residential Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to DO-O13 and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide a firefighting water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new policy as follows: <b>GRZ-PX Servicing</b> <b>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</b>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.06.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ	Oppose primary submission	<i>The RVA opposes this relief as the new policy sought is unnecessary given the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S196.FS.1	S089.06.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ	Oppose primary submission	<i>Ryman opposes this relief as the new policy sought is unnecessary given the Proposed Plan already has objectives and policies regarding infrastructure servicing.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S089.05.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ	Support primary submission	Support the request for consideration to be given for access to water supply for firefighting.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.07	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R6	Support in part	FENZ supports GRZ-R6 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 8m for any building. 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. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of Fire and Emergency in establishing and operating fire stations.	<b>Amend</b> height standards for GRZ-R6 as follows: <u>Exclude emergency service facilities up to 9m and hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S089.07.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the exclusion of hose drying towers from height in relation to boundary rules and standards, noting that 15m is significantly higher than the maximum permitted building height in the GRZ. It is unclear why these structures cannot be located away from boundaries in the GRZ.	Disallow primary submission.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.08	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-R6	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. In order for FENZ to effectively respond to a fire emergency, it is vital for a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 in both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to GRZ-R6 as follows: <u>GRZ-SX Servicing</u> <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> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.08.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	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 the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.08.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Ryman 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 the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.09	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx1	Support in part	FENZ supports GRZ-Rx1 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building. Fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, therefore GRZ-Rx1 provides for the requirements of a new fire station. However, hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community.	<b>Amend</b> height standards for GRZ-Rx1 as follows: <u>Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S089.09.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the exclusion of hose drying towers from height in relation to boundary rules and standards, noting that 15m is significantly higher than the maximum permitted building height in the GRZ. It is unclear why these structures cannot be located away from boundaries in the GRZ.	Disallow primary submission.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S089.09.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support the request for consideration to be given for access to water supply for firefighting. Request that amendments for any standards go through a consultation process.	Allow primary submission.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.10	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx1	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to GRZ-Rx1 as follows: <u>GRZ-SX Servicing</u> <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> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.10.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	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 the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.10.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Ryman 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 the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.11	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx2	Support in part	FENZ notes that an existing fire station is located within a Residential Intensification Precinct that may require additions or alterations in the future. As such, FENZ supports GRZ-Rx2 insofar as it permits new buildings and structures, or minor works, additions, and alterations to buildings and structures within Residential Intensification Precincts as a permitted activity. However, FENZ may have an operational/functional need to locate a new fire station in the area. Therefore, as per the previous points, FENZ seeks for a height exemption for hose drying towers within the Residential Intensification Precinct B area.	<b>Amend</b> height standards for GRZ-Rx2 as follows: <u>Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S089.11.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the exclusion of hose drying towers from height in relation to boundary rules and standards, noting that 15m is significantly higher than the maximum permitted building height in the GRZ. It is unclear why these structures cannot be located away from boundaries in the GRZ.	Disallow primary submission.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.12	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx2	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to GRZ-Rx2 as follows: <b>GRZ-SX Servicing</b> <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> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.12.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose primary submission	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 the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.12.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose primary submission	Ryman 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 the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.13	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx3	Support in part	As per the previous point discussed, FENZ seeks an exemption for fire stations and hose drying towers from height standards.	<b>Amend</b> height standards for GRZ-Rx3 as follows: <u>Exclude emergency service facilities up to 9m and hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S089.13.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-Rx3	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the exclusion of hose drying towers from height in relation to boundary rules and standards, noting that 15m is significantly higher than the maximum permitted building height in the GRZ. It is unclear why these structures cannot be located away from boundaries in the GRZ.	Disallow primary submission.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.14	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx3	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to GRZ-Rx3 as follows: <b>GRZ-SX Servicing</b> <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> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.14.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx3	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.14.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ-Rx3	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.15	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ-Rx5; GRZ-Rx6; GRZ-Rx7; GRZ-Rx8	Support in part	As per the points raised above, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx5, GRZ-Rx6, GRZ-Rx7, and GRZ-Rx8 as follows: <b>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</b> <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.15.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx5; GRZ-Rx6; GRZ-Rx7; GRZ-Rx8	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.15.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ-Rx5; GRZ-Rx6; GRZ-Rx7; GRZ-Rx8	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.16	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	GRZ	Not specified	FENZ notes that there are currently no provisions for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the GRZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	<b>Add</b> new rule to GRZ as follows: <b>GRZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities.</b> <b>Activity Status - Permitted</b>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S089.16.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.17	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MCZ	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Metropolitan Centre Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that 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 will give better effect to MCZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to MCZ as follows: <u>MCZ-OX Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u> <u>MCZ-PX Servicing</u> <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.17.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S089.17.FS02	Jonas, Malu	MCZ	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.17.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MCZ	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MCZ-R7	Support in part	FENZ supports MCZ-R7 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 21m for any building and structure. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m. Hose drying towers are structures that tend to be around 12 to 15 metres in height. Therefore, MCZ-R7 currently provides for the height provisions of fire stations and associated hose drying towers.	<b>Retain</b> height standards of MCZ-R7 as drafted.	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.19	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MCZ-R7	Support in part	However, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. In order for FENZ to effectively respond to a fire emergency, it is vital for a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 in both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to MCZ-R7 as follows: <u>MCZ-SX Servicing</u> <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> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.19.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.19.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.20	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MCZ-R11	Support in part	As per the previous submission point, FENZ seeks a new matter of control that ensures all new buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures in Precinct A are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply.	<b>Add</b> a matter of control to MCZ-R11 as follows: <u>x. Consideration of the provision of services, 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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.20.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S089.20.FS02	Jonas, Malu	MCZ-R11	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.20.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.21	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MCZ-R13; MCZ-R15	Support in part	As per the points raised above, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-R13 and MCZ-R15 as follows: <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.21.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-R13; MCZ-R15	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S089.21.FS02	Jonas, Malu	MCZ-R13; MCZ-R15	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.21.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MCZ-R13; MCZ-R15	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Metropolitan Centre Zone	Not specified	FENZ notes there are currently no provisions for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the MCZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Add new rule to MCZ as follows: <a href="#">MCZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities Activity Status - Permitted</a>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S089	S089.23	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Town Centre Zone	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Town Centre Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Town Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to TCZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	Add a new objective and policy to TCZ as follows: <a href="#">TCZ-OX Infrastructure</a> <a href="#">Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</a> <a href="#">TCZ-PX Servicing</a> <a href="#">Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.23.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Town Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.23.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Town Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.24	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R6	Support in part	FENZ supports TCZ-R6 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building. Fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, therefore TCZ-R6 provides for the requirements of a new fire station. However, hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community.	Amend height standards for TCZ-R6 as follows: <a href="#">Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</a>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S089	S089.25	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R6	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. In order for FENZ to effectively respond to a fire emergency, it is vital for a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 in both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Add a new standard to TCZ-R6 as follows: <a href="#">TCZ-SX Servicing</a> <a href="#">1. Where 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.</a> <a href="#">2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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.</a>  <a href="#">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.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.25.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.25.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	TCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.26	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R7	Support in part	Subject to the relief support in the previous submission point, FENZ supports TCZ-R7 insofar as it requires compliance with the permitted activity standards for new buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures under TCZ-R6.	Retain TCZ-R7 as drafted.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S089	S089.27	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R11	Support in part	FENZ supports TCZ-R11 insofar as it permits new buildings, structures and alterations / additions up to 21 metres in height, which provides for the requirements of fire stations and associated hose drying towers. However, as discussed in previous submission points, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplied Code of Practice.	Amend TCZ-R11 as follows: <a href="#">Matters of discretion are restricted to:</a> ... <a href="#">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.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.27.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.27.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.28	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-R13	Support in part	As discussed in previous submission points, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	Amend TCZ-R13 as follows: <a href="#">Matters of discretion are restricted to:</a> ... <a href="#">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.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.28.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.28.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	TCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.29	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-Rx4	Support in part	FENZ supports TCZ-Rx4 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 12m for any building and structure. Fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, therefore TCZ-Rx4 provides for the requirements of a new fire station. However, hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-Rx4 height standards as follows: <u>Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S089	S089.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	TCZ-Rx4	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	<b>Add</b> a new matter of discretion to TCZ-Rx4 as follows: <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.30.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-Rx4	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.30.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	TCZ-Rx4	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.31	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Town Centre Zone	Not specified	FENZ notes there are currently no provisions for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the TCZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	<b>Add</b> new rule to TCZ as follows: <u>TCZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status - Permitted.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S089	S089.32	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Local Centre Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Local Centre Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to LCZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to LCZ as follows: <u>LCZ-OX Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u> <u>LCZ-PX Servicing</u> <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.32.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Local Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.32.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Local Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.33	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-R6	Support in part	FENZ supports LCZ-R6 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 12m for any building and structure. Fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, therefore LCZ-R6 provides for the requirements of a new fire station. However, hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-R6 height standards as follows: <u>Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S089	S089.34	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-R6	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. In order for FENZ to effectively respond to a fire emergency, it is vital for a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 in both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to LCZ-R6 as follows: <u>LCZ-SX Servicing</u> <u>1. Where 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> <u>2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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> <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.34.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.34.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.35	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	LCZ-R12	Support in part	As discussed in previous submission points, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-R12 as follows: <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>...</u> <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S089.35.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.35.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.36	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	FENZ notes there are currently no provision for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the LCZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	<b>Add</b> new rule to LCZ as follows: <a href="#">LCZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities Activity Status - Permitted.</a>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.37	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Mixed Use Zone	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Mixed Use Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Mixed Use Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to MUZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to MUZ as follows: <a href="#">MUZ-OX Infrastructure</a> <a href="#">Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</a> <a href="#">MUZ-PX Servicing</a> <a href="#">Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.37.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.37.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Mixed Use Zone	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.38	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-R6	Support in part	FENZ supports MUZ-R6 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 12m for any building and structure. Fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, therefore MUZ-R6 provides for the requirements of a new fire station. However, hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R6 height standards as follows: <a href="#">Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</a>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.39	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-R6	Support in part	Furthermore, FENZ seeks a new standard that ensures all land use activities in this zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to firefighting water supply. In order for FENZ to effectively respond to a fire emergency, it is vital for a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008 in both reticulated and non -reticulated areas.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to MUZ-R6 as follows: <a href="#">MUZ-SX Servicing</a> <a href="#">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.</a> <a href="#">2. Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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.</a> <a href="#">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.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.39.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MUZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	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 this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.39.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MUZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate this in the Proposed Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.40	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-R9	Support in part	FENZ supports MUZ-R9 to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 10m for any building and structure. Fire stations are typically 8-9m in height, therefore MUZ-R9 provides for the requirements of a new fire station. However, hose drying towers can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers from height standards better provides for the health and safety of the community. FENZ notes that MUZ-R9 is a controlled activity that requires comply with the permitted activity standards for buildings and structures in the MUZ. Therefore, subject to relief sought regarding the inclusion of a servicing standard for buildings and structures in previous submission points, FENZ supports MUZ-R9.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R9 height standards as follows: <a href="#">Exclude hose drying towers up to 15m from height and height in relation to boundary standards.</a>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.41	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	MUZ-R13	Support in part	As discussed in previous submission points, FENZ 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, in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R13 as follows: <a href="#">Matters of discretion are restricted to:</a> <a href="#">... 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.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S089.41.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S089.41.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the purpose of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.42	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support in part	FENZ supports SUB-DW-Rx1 insofar as it requires all new allotments within the GRZ to be provided with a connection to a reticulated water supply when located within a reticulated areas. However, FENZ considers it vital that new allotments within the GRZ are provided with 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. The provision of an adequate firefighting water supply is vital to ensure FENZ can effectively respond to a fire emergency in both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-DW-Rx1 as follows:  All new allotments, other than allotments for access, roads, utilities or reserves, where the allotments are in or adjoining areas which are served with a Council reticulated water supply, must be provided with a connection to the Council reticulated water supply laid to the boundary of the allotment.  <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all allotments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u>  <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S089	S089.43	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support in part	FENZ considers it important that all subdivisions in all zones are provided with practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road / right of way. A fire appliance requires, as a minimum, access which is 4 metres in width and 4m in height clearance, with a maximum gradient of 15% (and accompanying transition ramps). Typically, buildings more than 50m away from legal roads require site access to be designed to meet the Code of Practice to ensure fire appliances can access a fire. The proposed rules and standards do not guarantee that adequate site access will be achieved via new driveways to access buildings that are in access of 50m from the nearest legal road with an unhindered vehicular access width of 4m or more. FENZ considers this would pose an unacceptable risk to any new buildings, its occupiers and any surrounding vegetation, as well as neighbouring properties and occupiers. It is requested that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.	<b>Add</b> a new standard to SUB-DW-Rx1 as follows:  <u>SUB-SX Access</u> <u>Every allotment must have practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road or by way of a registered right-of-way. Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>1. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>2. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>3. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>4. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>5. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>6. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S089.43.FS01	Jonas, Malu	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.44	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-DW-R23	Support	FENZ supports SUB-DW-R23 insofar as any subdivision that does not comply with one of more of the activity standards for water under rule SUB-DW-Rx1 is a non-complying activity.	<b>Retain</b> SUB-DW-R23 as drafted.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S089	S089.45	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-R25	Support	FENZ supports SUB-RES-R25 insofar as it includes controlled activity standard which require new allotments to: 1. Have legal and physical access to a legal road 2. Be serviced by public water supply systems However, FENZ considers fire safety matters are not sufficiently addressed under SUB-RES-R25 and therefore seek the inclusion of firefighting water supply and site access standards as per previous submission points.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-R25 as follows: <u>1. Each allotment must have legal and physical access to a legal road.</u> <u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>1. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>2. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>3. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>4. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>5. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>6. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>  <b>Add</b> a new water supply standard as follows:  <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all allotments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u>  <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S089.45.FS01	Jonas, Malu	SUB-RES-R25	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.46	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-R26	Support in part	As per the previous submission point, FENZ consider it vital for firefighting water supply and site access standards to be included in all subdivision rules. This will ensure that all new allotments are designed to consider FENZ's operational requirements and enable FENZ to efficiently and effectively respond to a fire emergency.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-R26 as follows: <u>1. Each allotment must have legal and physical access to a legal road.</u> <u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>1. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>2. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>3. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>4. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>5. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>6. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>  <b>Add a new water supply standard as follows:</b>  <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all allotments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u>  <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S054.FS.1	S089.46.FS01	Jonas, Malu	SUB-RES-R26	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.47	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support in part	FENZ supports SUB-RES-Rx1 insofar as it requires new allotments within the General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach to be provided with a firefighting water supply which complies with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. FENZ acknowledges the inclusion of a note advising applicants to consult with FENZ on the method of compliance with the Code of Practice. This is strongly support by FENZ. However, FENZ seeks to amend SUB-RES-Rx1 to ensure that fire appliances can access the firefighting water supply provided. Furthermore, as per previous submission points, FENZ requests that driveways which would be used to access buildings more than 50m from the nearest legal road be constructed to provide fire appliance access in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-Rx1 as follows: <u>1. Within the General Residential Zone at Te Horo Beach, a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, must be provided which complies in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>  <b>Add a new standard as follows:</b> <u>Every allotment must have practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road or by way of a registered right-of-way.</u> <u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>1. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>2. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>3. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>4. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>5. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>6. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S089	S089.48	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-R27	Support in part	As per the previous submission point, FENZ consider it vital for firefighting water supply and site access standards to be included in all subdivision rules. This will ensure that all new allotments are designed to consider FENZ's operational requirements and enable FENZ to efficiently and effectively respond to a fire emergency.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-R27 as follows: <u>3. Each allotment must have legal and physical access to a legal road.</u> <u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>1. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>2. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>3. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>4. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>5. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>6. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>  <b>Add a new water supply standard as follows:</b>  <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all allotments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u>  <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R27(refer section 10.7 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S054.FS.1	S089.48.FS01	Jonas, Malu	SUB-RES-R27	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.49	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-RES-R29	Support in part	Subject to relief sought in other relevant subdivision standards, FENZ supports SUB-RES-R29.	<b>Retain</b> SUB-RES-R29 as drafted.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.50	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	SUB-WORK-R36, SUB-WORK-R37, SUB-WORK-R39, SUB-WORK-R40, SUB-WORK-R41, SUB-WORK-R42, SUB-WORK-R43, SUB-WORK-R44	Support in part	As per the previous submission point, FENZ consider it vital for firefighting water supply and site access standards to be included in all subdivision rules. This will ensure that all new allotments are designed to consider FENZ's operational requirements and enable FENZ to efficiently and effectively respond to a fire emergency.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-WORK-R36, SUB-WORK-R37, SUB-WORK-R39, SUB-WORK-R40, SUB-WORK-R41, SUB-WORK-R42, SUB-WORK-R43, and SUB-WORK-R44 as follows: <u>1. Each allotment must have legal and physical access to a legal road.</u> <u>Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including:</u> <u>1. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and</u> <u>2. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and</u> <u>3. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and</u> <u>4. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and</u> <u>5. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles.</u> <u>6. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions</u>  <b>Add</b> a new water supply standard as follows:  <u>Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all allotments must be provided with a water supply, including a firefighting water supply, and access to that supply.</u>  <u>Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally 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>  <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>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S089.50.FS01	Jonas, Malu	SUB-WORK-R36, SUB-WORK-R37, SUB-WORK-R39, SUB-WORK-R40, SUB-WORK-R41, SUB-WORK-R42, SUB-WORK-R43, SUB-WORK-R44	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S089	S089.51	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	General Rural Zone	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the General Rural Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the General Rural Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to GRUZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply	<b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to GRUZ as follows:  <u>GRUZ-OX Infrastructure Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>  <u>GRUZ-PX Servicing Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.52	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	General Rural Zone	Not specified	FENZ notes there are currently no provisions for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the GRUZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	<b>Add</b> new rule to GRUZ as follows: <u>GRUZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status – Permitted</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.53	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Rural Lifestyle Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to RLZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to RLZ as follows:  <u>RLZ-OX Infrastructure</u> <u>Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>  <u>RLZ-PX Servicing</u> <u>Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.54	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Not specified	FENZ notes there are currently no provisions for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the RLZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	<b>Add</b> new rule to RLZ as follows: <u>RLZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status – Permitted</u>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.55	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rural Production Zone	Not specified	FENZ seeks a new objective that promotes the provision of infrastructure within the Rural Production Zone. Further, FENZ seeks the inclusion of a new policy that ensures all land use activities in the Rural Production Zone are adequately serviced, particularly in relation to reticulated water supply or an alternative method for firefighting purposes. This will give better effect to RPROZ-OX and provides a better policy framework for the new standard sought in this zone relating to the requirement to provide water supply.	<b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to RPROZ as follows:  <u>RPROZ-OX Infrastructure Public health and safety is maintained through the appropriate provision of infrastructure.</u>  <u>RPROZ-PX Servicing Ensure all development is appropriately serviced including wastewater, stormwater, and water supply with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes.</u>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S089	S089.56	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Rural Production Zone	Not specified	FENZ notes there are currently no provisions for the establishment of emergency service facilities within the RPROZ, and as such the activity could be considered a non-complying activity under current provisions. Therefore, FENZ seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency 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 considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity is vital given PC2 will enable increased density and development. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	<b>Add</b> new rule to RPROZ as follows: <a href="#">RPROZ-RX Emergency Service Facilities Activity Status – Permitted</a>	4.6.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Emergency Services Facilities	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.57	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	INF-MENU-R29	Support in part	FENZ supports INF-MENU-R29 insofar as it requires a potable water supply to be provided for all residential buildings in all rural zones and the GRZ at Te Horo Beach. However, for FENZ to respond to a fire emergency at residential buildings in the rural zone, it is vital an adequate firefighting water supply is provided whether the site is located within a reticulated or unreticulated area. Often, dwellings in rural zones are located outside of the reticulated network. A lack of reticulated water supply and increased response times in rural areas increases the fire risk to property, life and vegetation.	<b>Amend</b> INF-MENU-R29 as follows:  <a href="#">Where a connection to reticulated water supply system is available, all residential buildings must be provided with a 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.</a>  <a href="#">Where a connection to a reticulated water supply system is unavailable, or where an additionally level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, an alternative firefighting water supply and access to that supply, must be provided for each dwelling in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</a>	4.5.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Firefighting	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S089	S089.58	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	ECO-R7	Support in part	FENZ supports ECO-R7 insofar as it includes a matter of discretion relating to the effects on public safety. However, FENZ considers that a new assessment matter should be added in order to ensure that fire risk mitigation is taken into account when assessing applications to trim or remove indigenous vegetation.	<b>Add</b> a new assessment matter to ECO-R7 as follows:  <a href="#">The degree to which the trimming or removal of affected vegetation will provide for the health and safety of people, property, and the environment through the management of fire risk.</a>	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I agree with the submitter. In the context of the increased levels of development enabled by PC2, it is appropriate that consideration may be given to whether or not tree trimming will provide for the management of fire risk, as part of resource consent applications for trimming trees under the rule. I consider that this is consistent with the general approach to enabling the trimming of indigenous vegetation for health and safety purposes provided for under the rules of the ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter, including under policy ECO-P2 (clause 6) and rules ECO-R3 and ECO-R6.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend ECO-R7. Refer to sections 21.8 and 21.9 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it recognises that increased levels of development enabled by PC2 may prompt the need to consider the management of fire risk in relation to trimming or removing indigenous vegetation. I do not consider that this reduces consideration of the adverse effects associated with trimming or removing indigenous vegetation, as resource consent will continue to be necessary to trim or remove indigenous vegetation, and adverse effects will continue to be considered under the operative matters of discretion.
S090	S090.01	Starr, Alex	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S090.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S090.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. With reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S090	S090.02	Starr, Alex	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S090.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S091	S091.01	Murland, Shane and Jocelyn	65 Ratanui Road, Otaihangā	Not specified	The submission opposes not rezoning the property at 65 Ratanui Road from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone. The submission states that rezoning the land would give effect the NPS-UD. Reasons include: - Rezoning of the site would provide for it to be plan-enabled under the NPS-UD; - The area is indicated as a medium priority greenfield growth area in Te Tupu Pai; - Not rezoning the land now would otherwise result in further fragmentation of the land into lifestyle blocks, which will limit the ability of the land to accommodate urban growth in the future; - The site already meets the definition of being infrastructure-ready under the NPS-UD; - There is no indication that development of the site for residential would not be feasible or reasonably expected to be realised; - There are no qualifying matters that would preclude the rezoning of the land to General Residential Zone.	<b>Rezone</b> 65 Ratanui Road, Otaihangā, from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S235.FS.1	S091.01.FS01	Morris, Brent and Leanne	65 Ratanui Road, Otaihangā	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission point. Rezoning requests would create residential pockets in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There needs to be more planning than just allowing pockets of housing. Concerns regarding light pollution, impact of birds, reverse sensitivity of rural activities, lack of infrastructure.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S023.FS.1	S091.01.FS02	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	65 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Support primary submission	The submission is consistent with R P Mansell, A J Mansell, & M R Mansell's own submission and the relief sought is supported because it seeks the rezoning of high and medium priority greenfield growth areas identified in Te Tupu Pai district growth strategy, would assist PPC2-1 to implement the outcomes sought in the NPS-UD, and would meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S091.01.FS03	Jonas, Malu	65 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S091.01.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	65 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Oppose primary submission	These sites are subject to flooding risk. They should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Retain existing zoning	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S092	S092.01	Antcliff, Norman	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S092.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S092.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. With reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S092	S092.02	Antcliff, Norman	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S092.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S093	S093.01	Bellabby Ltd	73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Not specified	The submission opposes not rezoning the property at 73 Ratanui Road from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone. The submission states that rezoning the land would give effect to the NPS-UD. Reasons include: - Rezoning of the site would provide for it to be plan-enabled under the NPS-UD; - The area is indicated as a medium priority greenfield growth area in Te Tupu Pai; - Not rezoning the land now would otherwise result in further fragmentation of the land into lifestyle blocks, which will limit the ability of the land to accommodate urban growth in the future; - The site already meets the definition of being infrastructure-ready under the NPS-UD; - There is no indication that development of the site for residential would not be feasible or reasonably expected to be realised; - There are no qualifying matters that would preclude the rezoning of the land to General Residential Zone.	<b>Rezone</b> 73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga, from Rural Lifestyle Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S235.FS.1	S093.01.FS01	Morris, Brent and Leanne	73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission point. Rezoning requests would create residential pockets in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. There needs to be more planning than just allowing pockets of housing. Concerns regarding light pollution, impact of birds, reverse sensitivity of rural activities, lack of infrastructure.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S023.FS.1	S093.01.FS02	Mansell, RP, AJ and MR	73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Support primary submission	The submission is consistent with R P Mansell, A J Mansell, & M R Mansell's own submission and the relief sought is supported because it seeks the rezoning of high and medium priority greenfield growth areas identified in Te Tupu Pai district growth strategy, would assist PPC2-1 to implement the outcomes sought in the NPS-UD, and would meet the sustainable management purpose of the RMA.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S093.01.FS03	Jonas, Malu	73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S093.01.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	73 Ratanui Road, Otaihanga	Oppose primary submission	These sites are subject to flooding risk. They should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Retain existing zoning	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.01	KiwiRail	GRZ-Rx1	Not specified	KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity standard requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor.	Add a new setback standard to GRZ-Rx1: <u>x. Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</u>	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S094.01.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that this is not a Qualifying Matter. Kāinga Ora considers the 1.5m front yard and 1m side/rear yard setbacks, as required in the MDRS, is sufficient as this 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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.02	KiwiRail	General Residential Zone - Restricted Discretionary Activity rules	Not specified	KiwiRail seek a new matter of discretion for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity standard requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	Add a new provision to Restricted discretionary activity rules in the GRZ: Matters of discretion [...] <u>x. The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S094.02.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General Residential Zone - Restricted Discretionary Activity rules	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that this is not a Qualifying Matter. Kāinga Ora considers the 1.5m front yard and 1m side/rear yard setbacks, as required in the MDRS, is sufficient as this 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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.03	KiwiRail	Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone	Not specified	Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin the MCZ (Paraparaumu), TCZ (Ōtaki, Waikanae, Paraparaumu Beach and Raumatī Beach) and LCZ (Waikanae Beach, Kena Kena, Mazengarb Road, Meadows, Raumatī South and Paekākāriki). These zone chapters do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings or structures from the rail corridor. Consistent with the amendment to the MDRS in the GRZ, KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures in the MCZ, TCZ and LCZ to ensure the intensification changes appropriate manage potential safety impacts on the rail corridor.	Add a new permitted activity performance standard to MCZ, TCZ, and LCZ: <u>x. Buildings and structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor.</u>	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S094.03.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that this is not a Qualifying Matter. Kāinga Ora considers the 1.5m front yard and 1m side/rear yard setbacks, as required in the MDRS, is sufficient as this 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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.04	KiwiRail	Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone	Not specified	KiwiRail seeks a new matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.	Add a new matter of discretion to MCZ, TCZ, and LCZ: Matters of discretion [...] <u>x. The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S094.04.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that this is not a Qualifying Matter. Kāinga Ora considers the 1.5m front yard and 1m side/rear yard setbacks, as required in the MDRS, is sufficient as this 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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.05	KiwiRail	NOISE-R14	Not specified	KiwiRail seeks that noise controls requiring acoustic insulation apply to new and altered sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor.	Amend Noise-R14: 1. Any new or altered habitable room within a building that houses any noise sensitive activity (including rooms used for hospital recovery; but excluding rooms used for visitor accommodation, which is not temporary residential rental accommodation, outside of residential zones) on a subject site within any of the following: [...] a. within 40m 100m of the boundary of a designation for rail corridor purposes; and	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S094.05.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	NOISE-R14	Oppose primary submission	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S094.05.FS02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NOISE-R14	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought, noting that no evidence has been provided to justify why a 100m setback for habitable buildings from the boundary of a rail designation is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S094.05.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	NOISE-R14	Oppose primary submission	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.06	KiwiRail	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Not specified	KiwiRail seek that vibration controls be included to apply to sensitive uses within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary. KiwiRail seek that non compliance with the permitted standards be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	Add a new permitted activity rule to NOISE: Indoor railway vibration 1. Any new buildings or alterations to existing buildings containing a noise sensitive activity within 60 metres of the boundary of any railway network, must be protected from vibration arising from the nearby rail corridor. 2. Compliance with standard 1 above shall be achieved by a report submitted to the council demonstrating compliance with the following matters: (a) the new building or alteration or an existing building is designed, constructed and maintained to achieve rail vibration levels not exceeding 0.3 mm/s v.w.95 or (b) the new building or alteration to an existing building is a single-storey framed residential building with: i. a constant level floor slab on a full surface vibration isolation bearing with natural frequency not exceeding 10 Hz, installed in accordance with the supplier's instructions and recommendations; and ii. vibration isolation separating the sides of the floor slab from the ground; and iii. no rigid connections between the building and the ground.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S094.06.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Oppose primary submission	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122.FS.1	S094.06.FS02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought as indoor railway vibration is not identified as a Qualifying Matter under the RM Amendment Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S094.06.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Oppose primary submission	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S094	S094.07	KiwiRail	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Not specified	KiwiRail seek that vibration controls be included to apply to sensitive uses within 60m of the legal boundary of any railway boundary. KiwiRail seek that non compliance with the permitted standards be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	Add a restricted discretionary activity rule to NOISE (where the permitted activity standards outlined in S094.06 are not met) with the following matters of discretion: Matters of discretion: (a) location of the building; (b) the effects of any non-compliance with the activity specific standards; (c) special topographical, building features or ground conditions which will mitigate vibration impacts; (c) the outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S094.07.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Oppose primary submission	The RVA acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. The RVA considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S094.07.FS02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought as indoor railway vibration is not identified as a Qualifying Matter under the RM Amendment Act.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S094.07.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Noise Chapter - Vibration	Oppose primary submission	Ryman acknowledges that acoustic insulation for the purpose of noise and vibration controls may be appropriate in some areas located within or adjacent to a railway boundary with a purpose of providing protection / amenity to residents in such areas. Ryman considers however that such requirements need to be determined on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the distance of noise sensitive activities from these activities rather than from the boundaries.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - Rail corridors	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S095	S095.01	Berthold, Thomas and Fiona	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S095.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S095.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. With reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S095	S095.02	Berthold, Thomas and Fiona	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S095.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S096	S096.01	Brady, Diane and Steve	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S096.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the proposed enlargement of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years have been identified beyond the currently proposed Precinct. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S096.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. With reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones being coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S096	S096.02	Brady, Diane and Steve	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S096.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General	Support	Greater Wellington supports the proposed amendments to give effect to the NPS-UD, specifically to enable a range of building heights and densities within the metropolitan centre zone and the walkable catchment of that zone and train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Subject to recommendations to amend PC(N) made throughout this document.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S074.FS.1	S097.01.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	General	Support primary submission	No reasoning provided by submitter.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.01.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	General	Support primary submission	No reasoning provided by submitter.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.01.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	General	Support primary submission	No reasoning provided by submitter.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.01.FS04	Lambert, William	General	Support primary submission	No reasoning provided by submitter.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S097.01.FS05	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission and any amendments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.02	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Freshwater/Te Mana o Te Wai	Support in part	<p>Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks to begin to give effect to the NPS-FM by addressing the degradation of freshwater. The objective of the NPS-FM is to ensure that natural and physical resources are managed in a way that prioritises the health and well-being of water bodies and ecosystems as a first priority, the health needs of people as a second priority, and the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being as a third priority.</p> <p>Section 3.5 of the NPS-FM requires territorial authorities to include objectives, policies and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on the health and well-being of freshwater bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments.</p> <p>Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies FW.3 and 15 in particular) requires district plans to include provisions to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater and the coastal marine area.</p> <p>Any urban development may have direct impacts on freshwater bodies through potential effects such as increased stormwater runoff affecting both water quality and quantity, increased demand for potable and non-potable water supplies, or development adjacent to freshwater bodies affecting the form and function of those waterbodies and ecosystems. For these reasons, it is considered that having regard to PC2 with Proposed RPS Change 1 and giving effect to the NPS-FM is a related provision under Section 80E of the Act, which can be considered in this process. Greater Wellington supports the operative district plan's existing provisions that are consistent with Proposed RPS Change 1, including those that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek to avoid or mitigate offsite erosion and sediment losses</li> <li>• Avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on natural systems and</li> <li>• Require water use efficiency and non-potable alternative water sources.</li> </ul> <p>However, we seek additional amendments to strengthen existing provisions or new provisions to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically to provide for the health and well-being of waterbodies while enabling urban intensification.</p> <p>Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested and it is considered scope is available to do this through this ISPP. This is because related provisions in an IPI can relate to district wide matters which include strategic direction, infrastructure, natural environment values, subdivision and earthworks in accordance 80E(2)(a) and stormwater management in accordance with section 80E(2)(f).</p>	<p>Amendments are required to PC2 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and give effect to the operative RPS and NPS-FM. This includes, but is not limited to provisions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote positive effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on freshwater.</li> <li>• Recognise and integrate Te Mana o Te Wai through the plan.</li> <li>• Require an integrated, holistic approach that recognises the interconnectedness of land, freshwater and the coast (ki uta ki tai).</li> <li>• Recognise and protect Māori freshwater values and relationship to sites of significance.</li> <li>• Require subdivision, use and development to be managed in a manner that avoids, remedies or mitigates effects on rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs and riparian margins.</li> <li>• Include consideration of the off-site effects of earthworks and land development, including on form and function of waterbodies.</li> <li>• Provide for protection and enhancement of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, including wetlands, during structure planning and sub-division, such that water bodies must be identified and protected prior to any development occurring.</li> </ul> <p>It is considered amendments would likely be required across the plan, but particularly the following chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic direction.</li> <li>• Urban form and development.</li> <li>• Energy, infrastructure and transport.</li> <li>• Subdivision.</li> <li>• All zones.</li> </ul>	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161.FS.1	S097.02.FS01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Freshwater/Te Mana o Te Wai	Support primary submission	Support this submission because urban development and the proposed intensification could have adverse effects on the health of wai if it is not managed appropriately. Integrating Te Mana o Te Wai into the plan would ensure that the health of wai is prioritised and the plan would align with our values and aspirations for wai.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.03	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Stormwater Quality	Support in part	<p>Stormwater management is a significant factor that contributes towards the health and wellbeing of freshwater and coastal environments. The operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 include direction regarding stormwater management to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse effects on water quality arising from stormwater contaminant discharges associated with new developments. This direction includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrating planning and the design of stormwater management measures to achieve multiple improved outcomes.</li> <li>• Considering the effects of development in relation to water quality target attribute states and relevant regional plan limits.</li> <li>• Requiring water sensitive urban design principles in the control of stormwater infrastructure to improve water quality.</li> <li>• Managing land use and development in way that will minimise the generation of contaminants, including building materials, and the extent of impervious surfaces.</li> <li>• Requiring financial contributions through conditions of consent where off site stormwater quality treatment is required as set out in a Stormwater Management Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Urban intensification provided for by PC2 is likely to influence the generation of stormwater and its associated effects on water quality and quantity through the redevelopment of sites and increased impervious areas.</p> <p>Greater Wellington acknowledges and supports the provisions in the operative district plan and Land Development Minimum Requirements that already go some way to align with Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3).</p> <p>However, further amendments are necessary to strengthen existing provisions or insert additional provisions, particularly with regards to managing development impacts on water quality and providing for multiple improved outcomes of nature-based solutions for stormwater management. Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested and it is considered scope is available to do this through this ISPP. This is because related provisions in an IPI can relate to stormwater management in accordance with section 80E(2)(f) as being consequential to the MDRS and policies 3, 4 and 5 of the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Amend PC2 to have regard to the direction on stormwater management set out in the operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1. This relief should consider objectives, policies, rules and matters of discretion that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the application of water sensitive urban design principles, including sustainable stormwater design to minimise impacts on the natural environment and achieves outcomes additional to stormwater treatment such as providing amenity spaces, ecological habitat.</li> <li>• Restrict the use of copper/zinc and other such building materials to manage contaminant generation.</li> <li>• Manage effects of subdivision, use and development on water quality, waterway values including hydrological and ecosystem processes, riparian margins, water users and cultural values.</li> </ul> <p>Amendments would be required in several plan chapters including, infrastructure, subdivision and zone chapters.</p>	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S097.03.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Stormwater Quality	Oppose primary submission	<p>The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The matters addressed in the submission point should be properly considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan.</li> <li>- Further, the effects of subdivision, use and development on water quality, waterway values, including hydrological and ecosystem processes, riparian margins, water users and cultural values are not suitable as a matter of discretion as they do not respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment.</li> <li>- To the extent the reasons given on this submission point refer to financial contributions (although no specific relief is sought) Council's development contributions policy already requires contributions for Network Infrastructure, which includes stormwater.</li> </ul>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054.FS.1	S097.03.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Stormwater Quality	Support primary submission	Support this submission and any amendments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S097.03.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Stormwater Quality	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as: - The matters addressed in the submission point should be properly considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. - Further, the effects of subdivision, use and development on water quality, waterway values, including hydrological and ecosystem processes, riparian margins, water users and cultural values are not suitable as a matter of discretion as they do not respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment. - To the extent the reasons given on this submission point refer to financial contributions (although no specific relief is sought) Council's development contributions policy already requires contributions for Network Infrastructure, which includes stormwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.03.FS04	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Stormwater Quality	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.03.FS05	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Stormwater Quality	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.03.FS06	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Stormwater Quality	Support primary submission	We support this submission because improving stormwater management is an important aspect of looking after the health of wai. Improved stormwater management, by way of monitoring and considering the effects of development on multiple different aspects of Taiao, will be significant for achieving sustainable management of our water resources. It is also important that these provisions are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and recognise rangatiratanga.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.03.FS07	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Stormwater Quality	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.04	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support in part	Stormwater runoff is likely to increase as a result of PC2 due to new growth areas and greater levels of impervious surfaces. Proposed RPS Change 1 includes direction regarding the management of stormwater: • Requiring water sensitive urban design principles in the control of stormwater infrastructure to reduce flooding. • Managing land use and development in way that will minimise the extent of impervious surfaces. • Requiring financial contributions through conditions of consent where off site stormwater quantity treatment is required as set out in a Stormwater Management Plan. • Requiring hydrological controls to avoid adverse effects of runoff quantity (flows and volumes) and maintain to the extent practicable, natural stream flows.  Greater Wellington acknowledges and supports the provisions in the operative district plan and Land Development Minimum Requirements that already go some way to align with the direction set out in the operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3). Additionally, Greater Wellington supports SUB-DW-Rx1 in PC2 and the requirement for hydraulic neutrality.  However, it is considered the requirement for hydraulic neutrality should be extended beyond subdivision development to ensure that all new development is also required to achieve hydrological controls as specified in Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage potential increases in stormwater runoff quantity (flows and volumes).  Greater Wellington considers there is scope to make these amendments as related provisions in an IPI can relate to stormwater management in accordance with section 80E(2)(f).	Amend PC2 to have regard to the direction on stormwater runoff set out in the operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1. This relief should consider objectives, policies, rules and matters of discretion that: • Require hydrological controls for use, development and subdivision of land. • Require sustainable stormwater design to minimise impacts on the natural environment and achieves outcomes additional to flood control such as providing amenity spaces, ecological habitat.  To achieve this relief, it is anticipated that amendments would be required in the infrastructure chapter, subdivision chapter and in zone chapters.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.04.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Stormwater needs to be managed and allowed for as a qualifying matter and a qualifying matter precinct that aligns with natural hazards including inundation should be adopted.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.04.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Stormwater needs to be managed and allowed for as a qualifying matter and a qualifying matter precinct that aligns with natural hazards including inundation should be adopted.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.04.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Stormwater needs to be managed and allowed for as a qualifying matter and a qualifying matter precinct that aligns with natural hazards including inundation should be adopted.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.04.FS04	Lambert, William	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Stormwater needs to be managed and allowed for as a qualifying matter and a qualifying matter precinct that aligns with natural hazards including inundation should be adopted.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S197.FS.1	S097.04.FS05	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Oppose primary submission	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 provisions of housing to respond to demand, contrary to the intent of the NPSUD. The RVA also questions whether some of the matters outlined in the submission points are more appropriately considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and whether a requirement to 'achieve outcomes additional to flood control such as providing amenity spaces...' is appropriate as it does not appear to respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S101.FS.1	S097.04.FS06	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	No specific reasons given.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054.FS.1	S097.04.FS07	Jonas, Malu	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Support this submission and any amendments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S097.04.FS08	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point as the relief sought is not clear and has the potential to slow down the provisions of housing to respond to demand, contrary to the intent of the NPSUD. Ryman also questions whether some of the matters outlined in the submission points are more appropriately considered under the Proposed Natural Resources Plan, and whether a requirement to 'achieve outcomes additional to flood control such as providing amenity spaces...' is appropriate as it does not appear to respond to any adverse effects of allowing the activity on the environment.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.04.FS09	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.04.FS10	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.04.FS11	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	We support this submission because improving stormwater management is an important aspect of looking after the health of wai. Improved stormwater management, by way of monitoring and considering the effects of development on multiple different aspects of Taiao, will be significant for achieving sustainable management of our water resources. It is also important that these provisions are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai and recognise rangatiratanga.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.04.FS12	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Stormwater - runoff flows and volumes	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.05	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Support in part	<p>Urban development will increase demand for water supply for both potable and non-potable use. As the effects of climate change become more evident, changes in weather patterns may impact the availability of water sources and equally the demand for water. Water abstraction beyond sustainable limits adversely affects the health and wellbeing of freshwater bodies and together with the impacts of climate change, there are greater risks of further freshwater degradation.</p> <p>Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies FW.2 and FW.3 in particular) seeks to manage pressures on existing water supplies and requires district plans to include provisions that improve the efficiency of end of use of water and require alternate water supplies for non-potable use in new developments. Additionally, Policy FW.5 requires consideration of how climate change may impact water supply, including water availability and water demand.</p> <p>Greater Wellington supports the operative district plan's existing provisions that align with Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically those that require non-potable alternative water sources and provide for greywater reuse systems. However, Greater Wellington seeks for PC2 to go further.</p> <p>It is considered scope is available to make the necessary amendments as related provisions in an IPI can relate to infrastructure in accordance with section 80E(2)(d).</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> PC2 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate policies and rules to require improved water use efficiency for new developments.</li> <li>Require new development to ensure adequate available water supply in a changing climate now and into the future.</li> </ul> <p>It is anticipated that amendments would be incorporated into the infrastructure chapter.</p>	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.3	S097.05.FS01	Landlink	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Support primary submission	Support principle of demand reduction, however KCDC's Grey water code of practice addresses this.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.3	S097.05.FS02	Landlink	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Oppose primary submission	Do not support second comment from GWRC, as it is unclear how developers can reasonably ensure adequate water supply now and into the future. Should be the responsibility of the TA to provide resilient networks and plan for future demand.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S097.05.FS03	Jonas, Malu	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Support primary submission	Support this submission and any amendments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.05.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.05.FS05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Support primary submission	Support this submission because adaptation to climate change and sustainable practices are essential for upholding Te Mana o Te Wai.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.05.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Climate change, freshwater bodies - water supply	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.06	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support in part	Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.1, CC.2, CC.3 and CC.9 in particular) seeks to manage enable changes to transport infrastructure to maximise the use of low or zero carbon transport modes, to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Greater Wellington acknowledges the Operative District Plan has already taken steps to provide for efficient travel and maximise mode choices to enable people to act sustainably, and that further amendments to transport provisions are proposed in Plan Change 1A (accessible car parking) and 1C (cycle parking requirements). Greater Wellington supports this existing direction. Similarly, Greater Wellington recognise PC2 already aligns with Proposed RPS Change 1 and supports several amendments, including: • DO-O3 which aims to deliver urban environments that support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. • DO-O16 to reinforce a compact, well designed and sustainable District through promoting and reinforcing a close proximity and good accessibility between living, business and employment areas. • MCZ-P2 which requires subdivision, use and development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone to improve public transport networks including rail. • MCZ-P5, TCZ-P3, LCZ-P3, MUZ-P4 which requires subdivision, use and development activities in the Working Zones to promote opportunities to maximise transport choice and efficiency particularly with regards to public and community transport. • The Proposed Residential Design Guide. • TR-P2, TR-R10, GIZ-R11 which require travel plans for major traffic activities. However, Greater Wellington considers further amendments are required to support a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and increase opportunities for zero or low carbon public and active transport modes. Across the District Plan there appears to be a gap in explicit provision of EV or e-bike charging stations, and Greater Wellington considers rules and associated standards for residential development should be a requirement. Travel Demand Management Plans, as sought by Policy CC.2, should be a requirement for any development or subdivision over a threshold specified in the District Plan. Requirements for Travel Demand Management Plans should be amended to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically to ensure that there are measures set out to reduce reliance on private vehicles and encourage modal shift to low carbon, active or public transport options. Amendments may be required in several chapters across the plan. We consider scope is available to do this as related provisions in an IPI can relate to district-wide matters which would include climate change and transport in accordance with Section 80E(2)(a). Infrastructure is also a related provision under Section 80E(2)(d).	<b>Amend</b> PC2 to have regard to the direction on reducing greenhouse gas emissions set out in Proposed RPS Change 1. This relief should consider objectives, policies, rules and matters of discretion that: • Require EV or e-bike charging stations for residential development. • Amend provisions to broaden the requirement for Travel Plans to comprehensive housing developments and subdivisions, and ensure the contents of Travel Plans is consistent with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy CC.2.  To achieve this relief, it is considered amendments will likely be required to the transport chapter, infrastructure chapter and zone chapters.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S074.FS.1	S097.06.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Climate change - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.06.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Climate change - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.06.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Climate change - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.06.FS04	Lambert, William	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Climate change - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S197.FS.1	S097.06.FS05	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	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 relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow primary submission, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053.FS.1	S097.06.FS06	Waka Kotahi	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission in part	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.	Allow in part. Waka Kotahi considers more information is required and seeks to be involved with the development of the policy.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S097.06.FS07	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Allow primary submission, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provision.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.06.FS08	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.06.FS09	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	We support this submission because including this direction in the plan will better enable adaptation to and mitigation of climate change.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.06.FS10	Nga Hapū o Ōtaki	Climate change - transport infrastructure	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.07	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Climate Change - Emissions Assessments	Support in part	In managing the effects of emissions from transport, Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks to encourage a whole of life carbon emissions assessment to understand the impacts and options of any new or altered transport infrastructure (Policy CC.11). Greater Wellington seeks that PC2 has regard to this policy and suggests a new policy for the district plan. This policy should encourage carbon emissions assessment for certain types of development involving new or altered transport infrastructure and could also specify what these assessments must include. Scope is available through PC2 to include this additional policy direction as related provisions in an IPI can relate to district-wide matters which would include climate change and transport in accordance with Section 80E(2)(a). Infrastructure is also a related provision under Section 80E(2)(d).	<b>Amend</b> PC2 to have regard to Policy CC.11 of Proposed RPS Change 1 by: • Inserting a new policy in the transport chapter to encourage carbon emissions assessments for certain developments that include new or altered transport infrastructure.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197.FS.1	S097.07.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Climate Change - Emissions Assessments	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD in that it will slow down, not speed up intensification and has the potential to affect the consenting requirements of retirement villages.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053.FS.1	S097.07.FS02	Waka Kotahi	Climate Change - Emissions Assessments	Support primary submission in part	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.	Allow primary submission in part. Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved with the development of the policy.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S097.07.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Climate Change - Emissions Assessments	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes this relief as it is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD in that it will slow down, not speed up intensification and has the potential to affect the consenting requirements of retirement villages.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.07.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Climate Change - Emissions Assessments	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.07.FS05	Nga Hapū o Ōtaki	Climate Change - Emissions Assessments	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.08	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Climate change - resilient urban areas and nature-based solutions	Support in part	Proposed RPS Change 1 includes direction to manage these adverse effects by supporting changes which provide for building the resilience of our urban areas particularly the use of nature-based solutions.  Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks that district plans provide for climate-resilient urban areas, including: • Urban greening to provide urban cooling and carbon storage. • The application of water sensitive urban design principles to reduce flooding, improve water quality and overall environmental quality. • Capturing, storing and recycling water at a community-scale. • Providing for the efficient use of water and energy in buildings and infrastructure. • Providing for buildings and infrastructure that are able to withstand the predicted future temperatures, intensity and duration of rainfall and wind.  Greater Wellington recognises and supports the provisions in the operative District Plan and PC2 which enable the erection of solar panels and roof mounted domestic scale turbines and promote energy efficiency in new development. Additionally, provisions requiring new development to provide non-potable water sources such as through roof rainwater collection and the use of low impact stormwater infrastructure are aligned with Proposed RPS Change 1.  However, it is considered the requirement to provide for climate-resilient urban development should be strengthened to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.4, CC.14, CC.7, CC.12 and FW.5) and consider the impacts of climate change now and into the future.  As a district-wide matter, Greater Wellington considers climate-resilience is a matter within scope of PC2 under Section 80E(2)(a) because climate change is a district-wide matter.	Amend PC2 to have regard to the direction contributing to the climate resilience of the urban area as set out in Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies CC.4 and CC.14. This relief should consider objectives, policies, rules and matters of discretion that: • Seek to improve climate resilience of urban areas through measures identified in Policy CC.14. • Clearly signal the Council's intent to improve the climate resilience of urban areas. • Require new development to include actions and initiatives that improve broader climate resilience of the urban area • Require new development to ensure adequate available water supply including consideration of how climate change may affect existing supplies and the need to develop further water supply sources. • Consider the extent to which new development design will contribute to climate resilience as a matter of discretion.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.3	S097.08.FS01	Landlink	Climate change - resilient urban areas and nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Acknowledge and support the sentiment of a greater focus on the climate change initiatives as part of Plan Change 2 and their importance in giving full effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S097.08.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Climate change - resilient urban areas and nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Support this submission and strengthening the requirements to provide for greater resilience in urban developments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.08.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Climate change - resilient urban areas and nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.08.FS04	Nga Hapū o Ōtaki	Climate change - resilient urban areas and nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.09	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Climate change – promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support in part	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....' Greater Wellington supports the operative district plan policy INF-MENU-P18 which considers the use of low impact design including soft engineering to manage stormwater quantity and quality. However, Greater Wellington seeks that PC2 has regard to Proposed Change 1 to the RPS and sets out a clear preference for nature-based solutions in all infrastructure and development, and provides a framework for their development. A number of actions are set out in Policy CC.14 as measures that should be considered and provided for.  It is considered that there is scope to make the requested amendments as related provisions relating to climate change and stormwater can be included in an IPI under Section 80E(2).	<b>Amend</b> PC2 to have regard to Policy CC.7 and • Include policy that seeks nature-based solutions when providing for new infrastructure and in new developments, such as the use of green infrastructure. • Permit the development of green infrastructure in appropriate locations and subject to necessary controls, i.e., planting works undertaken by regional council.  It is anticipated that amendments would be incorporated into the infrastructure, subdivision and zone chapters.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S097.09.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Climate Change - promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support primary submission	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.	Allow primary submission in part. Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved with the development of the policy.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.3	S097.09.FS02	Landlink	Climate Change - promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support further exploration and integration of the use of 'green infrastructure' to support developments. Acknowledge and support the sentiment of a greater focus on the climate change initiatives as part of Plan Change 2 and their importance in giving full effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S097.09.FS03	Jonas, Malu	Climate Change - promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support this submission and strengthening the requirements to provide for greater resilience in urban developments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.09.FS04	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Climate Change - promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.09.FS05	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Climate Change - promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.09.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Climate Change - promoting nature-based solutions in development and infrastructure	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.10	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Climate change – protecting ecosystems providing nature-based solutions	Support in part	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. PC2 should be amended to recognise these natural nature-based solutions and their role in managing the effects from development as part of the district's climate change response. These areas must be protected and enhanced where possible to ensure they continue to provide their functions. As climate change is a district-wide matter, Greater Wellington consider provisions relating to nature-based solutions are a matter within scope of PC2 under Section 80E(2)(a).	<b>Amend</b> PC2 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 and 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: • Direct the protection of areas that already perform a function as a nature-based solution, including the many wider benefits they can have. • Encourage the restoration of nature-based solutions.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.3	S097.10.FS01	Landlink	Climate change – protecting ecosystems providing nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Support further exploration into the protection of nature based infrastructure solutions.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S097.10.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Climate change – protecting ecosystems providing nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Support this submission and strengthening the requirements to provide for greater resilience in urban developments.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.10.FS03	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Climate change – protecting ecosystems providing nature-based solutions	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.11	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support in part	KCDC is not proposing any changes to the existing provisions for ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity protection. PC2 applies these existing provisions as qualifying matters. Greater Wellington considers this approach consistent with regional direction for indigenous biodiversity protection, except in relation to biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation addressed below. We support KCDC's approach to accommodate existing qualifying matters relating to PC2 for the protection of ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity. Proposed RPS Change 1 sets out specific direction for the use of biodiversity offsetting and compensation, requiring that biodiversity offsets or compensations achieve an outcome of at least an overall 10% gain in biodiversity benefit. Additionally, limits to the use of biodiversity offsetting and compensation are included in Policy 24 and new Appendix 1A. The operative district plan includes some guidance on the principles of offsetting but does not yet have regard to the amendments set out in Proposed RPS Change 1. Development occurring as a result of PC2 may impact on significant indigenous biodiversity or habitats of significant indigenous species. In particular the application of the MDRS and Intensification Precincts overlaps with scheduled ecological sites and indigenous trees. Although it is noted the existing District Plan provisions for these matters will continue to apply as a qualifying matter, Greater Wellington consider the existing plan provisions are not sufficient as they currently exist. Amendments may be required across the plan to address the relief requested and it is considered scope is available to do this through this ISPP. These additional provisions or amendments would apply as existing qualifying matters and as related provisions as a districtwide matter under Section 80E(2)(a).	<b>Amend</b> PC2 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 24, specifically in relation to biodiversity offsetting and compensation. Amendments to existing, or new policies, rules and appendices are expected to be necessary to achieve this relief in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S097.11.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation	Support primary submission in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the changes. 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.	Allow primary submission in part. Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved with changes to the plan as a result of the submission point.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.12	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Mana whenua / tangata whenua values and managing indigenous biodiversity	Not specified	Proposed RPS Change 1 recognises the mana whenua / tangata whenua values associated with managing indigenous biodiversity in Policies IE.1 and IE.2 which seek: • To identify and protect taonga species • To provide for mana whenua values including giving local effect to Te Rito o te Harakeke • Incorporate the use of mātauranga Māori in the management and monitoring of indigenous biodiversity • Support access to and customary use of indigenous biodiversity  Greater Wellington requests that PC2 has regard to these policies, specifically applying mātauranga Māori frameworks and supporting tangata whenua in managing and monitoring biodiversity. It is considered there is scope to make the necessary amendments as existing qualifying matters and as related provisions as a district-wide matter under Section 80E(2)(a).	<b>Amend</b> PC2 to have regard to Policies IE.1 and IE.2 of Proposed Change 1 to the RPS, particularly to incorporate mātauranga Māori and include tangata whenua in biodiversity monitoring. Amendments are expected to be incorporated in the ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S186.FS.1	S097.12.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Mana whenua / tangata whenua values and managing indigenous biodiversity	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.12.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Mana whenua / tangata whenua values and managing indigenous biodiversity	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.12.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Mana whenua / tangata whenua values and managing indigenous biodiversity	Support primary submission	Support suggested provisions to be incorporated into the plan because they will better enable mana whenua to be more involved in the process of biodiversity monitoring, which will result in clarifying our role. This will also support mana whenua in sustaining mātauranga and monitoring skills which aligns with our tikanga.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.12.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Mana whenua / tangata whenua values and managing indigenous biodiversity	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Mana whenua can make an important contribution in this area.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.13	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Integrated management and decision making	Support in part	New provisions are required in the district plan to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 direction on integrated management. These matters should be provided for as part of the strategic direction guiding the implementation of the District Plan, to ensure that urban intensification provided for by PC2 occurs in a holistic, integrated manner that realises the overarching objective in Proposed RPS Change 1. As a district-wide matter, Greater Wellington consider provisions regarding integrated management are within scope of PC2 under Section 80E(2)(a).	<b>Insert</b> new strategic direction to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically to require resource management decisions to be made using an integrated and holistic approach guided by Te Ao Māori.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S097.13.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Integrated management and decision making	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.13.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Integrated management and decision making	Support primary submission	Support this submission because it supports the integration of Te Ao Māori into resource management decision making processes which will better align with our values and tino rangatiratanga.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S097.13.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Integrated management and decision making	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Mana whenua can make an important contribution in this area.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.14	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Earthworks	Support in part	Intensification will result in the development or re-development of sites which will inevitably involve earthworks. Greater Wellington considers earthworks have the potential to have adverse effects on the water quality of any waterbody, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga and habitat of indigenous species. Proposed RPS Change 1 includes direction to manage these adverse effects. We recognise and support the provisions in the operative District Plan which already align with the Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1. We note specifically EW-P1, EW-R2, EW-R3, EWR4 and EW-R7. Additionally, we support the provisions which manage earthworks which can threaten important landscape, historic heritage, archaeological and cultural values. However, Greater Wellington considers stronger direction is required to recognise the adverse effects of earthworks on water quality. We seek amendments which more clearly seek to minimise the potential for sediment to enter waterbodies and recognise the ecological and cultural impacts of this. Additionally, we wish to ensure this potential effect is assessed in any resource consent application involving disturbance works, including vegetation clearance which may require amendments to the matters of discretion for relevant restricted discretionary activities. Greater Wellington considers provisions regarding earthworks are within scope of PC2 under Section 80E(2)(b) as related provisions.	Amend existing provisions, or insert new provisions, including matters of discretion to ensure that the sedimentation effects on water quality arising from earthworks associated with new development are minimised and assessed in resource consent applications. It is expected that amendments would be required in the earthworks chapter and zone chapters.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S097.14.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Earthworks	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.14.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Earthworks	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.14.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Earthworks	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Mana whenua can make an important contribution in this area.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.15	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Natural Hazards	Support in part	Proposed RPS Change 1 amends policies setting out direction regarding the assessment and management of natural hazard risks and land use (Policies 29, 51 and 52). The operative district plan manages natural hazards adopting a risk-based approach and includes consideration of some matters outlined in the RPS. We also support PC2 including natural hazards as qualifying matters: • Flood hazard category areas and fault avoidance areas as existing qualifying matters given the overlap of the MDRS and application of Policy 3 with the flood hazard overlays. • The new Coastal Qualifying Matter precinct to provide for the management of this area which is susceptible to coastal erosion hazard.  However, further policy direction and/or rules are requested to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. As a qualifying matter and district-wide matter, Greater Wellington considers provisions regarding natural hazard management are within scope of PC2 under Section 80E(2).	Amend existing provisions or insert new provisions in the Natural Hazards chapter to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies 29, 51 and 52 and Objectives 19 and 20, including but not limited to: • Use 'minimise' instead of 'reduce' when referring to risks from natural hazards. • Consider the exacerbating effects of climate change and sea level rise. • 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 methods on the natural environment where they are necessary. • More clearly direct subdivision, use and development and hazard sensitive activities to be avoided in areas where hazards and risks are assessed as high to extreme. • Provide guidance on the development of hazard mitigation measures, including considerations set out in Policy 52 of Change 1 to the RPS.  Further consequential amendments may be required in the subdivision and zones chapters.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.15.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Natural Hazards	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.15.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Natural Hazards	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.15.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Natural Hazards	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.15.FS04	Lambert, William	Natural Hazards	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053.FS.1	S097.15.FS05	Waka Kotahi	Natural Hazards	Support primary submission in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the changes. 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. In particular Waka Kotahi seek to ensure that there is pathway to maintain critical infrastructure.	Allow primary submission in part. Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved with changes to the plan as a result of the submission point.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S097.15.FS06	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Natural Hazards	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports a risk-based approach to managing hazards. However, the natural hazard risk-based provisions as drafted can appropriately manage development in areas prone to hazard.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.15.FS07	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Natural Hazards	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.16	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Qualifying Matters	Support in part	Greater Wellington supports the identification of existing qualifying matters as set out in the section 32 report for PC2.  For these matters, Greater Wellington generally consider that the existing operative plan provisions notified through PC2 are appropriate. However, Greater Wellington seeks some amendments through this submission where those existing provisions may require revising, particularly to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Amend as requested in other submission points.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.17	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Objectives, policies and rules	Support	Greater Wellington strongly supports the introduction of the Marae Takiwā precinct and associated provisions to provide for a lower level of development, to manage effects on adjacent marae. These provisions align with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy UD.1, which seeks recognition of marae as taonga and make appropriate provision for them.	Retain as notified.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S097.17.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Objectives, policies and rules	Support primary submission	The Ātiawa submission seeks amendments to these provisions to more appropriately provide for Marae. Extend the extent of the Marae Takiwā Precinct as shown on Map 10 Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure, Districtwide to include Frater Place.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.17.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Objectives, policies and rules	Support primary submission	See NHOO submission points for the marae precinct to go broader to cover wider papakāinga area	Allow primary submission in part.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.18	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Intensification adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	Greater Wellington supports existing protection of Waahi tapu and other places and areas of significance to Māori as a qualifying matter through PC2. However, Greater Wellington requests modification to the MDRS adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, to ensure the values of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are preserved as part of intensification activities.  This request gives effect to the relevant Operative RPS Policies, namely: (a) 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 (b) Policy 49 of the RPS, which directs that plans recognise 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. (c) Historic heritage policies 21, 22 and 46.  The extent of modification necessary will require a situation-specific impact analysis, and in some instances intensification adjacent to scheduled sites should be avoided.	Modify intensification levels through setbacks and reduced building heights for areas adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori to the extent necessary following site-specific analysis, except where the associated buildings and structures will provide for tino rangatiratanga.  This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I acknowledge the matter raised by the submitter, and note that the Marae Takiwā Precinct proposed by PC(N) provides for reduced building heights on sites adjacent to marae. Section 6.1.5 and Appendix T of the Section 32 Evaluation Report include site-specific analysis and justification for the reduced building heights in relation to these two areas.  However, there is no site specific analysis and justification for reducing building heights in areas adjacent to all other sites and areas of significance to Māori identified in Schedule 9 of the District Plan. I therefore do not consider it to be appropriate to do so, on the basis that any reduction in building height has not been justified as a qualifying matter in the terms required by sections 77J or 77P of the RMA. I note that the Council is separately preparing a mana whenua plan change, and it may be appropriate for this matter to be reviewed as part of that plan change.	Do not accept.	No.
S104.FS.1	S097.18.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	Intensification adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S097.18.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Intensification adjacent to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support primary submission	We support this submission point because this will ensure that our sites and their values are preserved in the face of intensification. As wāhi tapu are qualifying matters under section 6 of the RMA and the IPI states that accommodating for qualifying matters may include reduced building heights and lower density it would be appropriate to reduce intensification levels around them.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.19	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General	Support	Greater Wellington strongly supports the introduction of a new chapter into the district plan to address papakāinga and the amendments that provide for papakāinga development, including changes to the definition of papakāinga. We support enabling papakāinga across the district.  The proposed provisions recognise that papakāinga is taonga and provide for tangata whenua to exercise their tino rangatiratanga with fewer restrictions. PC2 aligns with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies UD.1 and UD.2, which also seeks provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands by: • Enabling mana whenua to exercise their tino rangatiratanga • Recognising papakāinga are taonga and making appropriate provision for them • Recognising the historical, contemporary, cultural and social importance of papakāinga and • Providing for the development of land owned by mana whenua.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that I recommend amendments to the provisions in response to submissions.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations to amend the provisions through other submissions.	No.
S097	S097.20	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General	Support in part	Greater Wellington supports the amendments made to the financial contributions chapter which align with Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies FW.3 and FW.4, particularly the clarity regarding how the contribution required is applied to stormwater disposal systems.  However, it is currently unclear in the notified provisions whether financial contributions can be required to upgrade or provide new stormwater infrastructure necessary to treat increased contaminant discharges in stormwater runoff to meet water quality outcomes. PC2 makes it clear that a reason for a financial contribution is where an outfall is available but there is inadequate capacity with the cost being the value of connecting and upgrading the capacity of the network. It is not certain whether this extends to costs associated with upgrading the treatment capacity of the network rather than the volumetric capacity. Policy FW.4 in Proposed RPS Change 1 requires district plans to include policies and rules to require financial contributions to be applied for off-site stormwater quality and quantity treatment as set out in a stormwater management plan, unless a development contribution for the same purpose has already been collected. PC2 should be amended to have regard to Policy FW.4, by ensuring that financial contributions can be collected for offsite stormwater treatment for both quality and quantity.	Pending any review KCDC may make on a Development Contributions policy under the Local Government Act in the near future, amend PC2 to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy FW.4 by clarifying that financial contributions for new subdivision and development can be collected to treat both stormwater quality and quantity.	4.17 Financial Contributions	I note that the matters for consideration in determining level and / or nature of financial contribution for stormwater disposal services under FC-Table x2 include "the quality and quantity of the supply". However, I consider that to improve the clarity of the provision in relation to stormwater disposal, this should be amended to include "or disposal" after the word "supply".	Accept in part. Minor amendment to improve interpretation of the standard.	Yes. Amend FC-Table x2 (refer section 15.3 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation I consider these amendments to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because they provides for a clearer, more efficient and effective interpretation of the standard.
S197.FS.1	S097.20.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting requirements of retirement villages. The RVA opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, and that do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow primary submission, and allow relief sought in RVA's primary submission.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053.FS.1	S097.20.FS02	Waka Kotahi	General	Support primary submission in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the changes. 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.	Allow primary submission in part. Waka Kotahi considers more information is required. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved with changes to the plan as a result of the submission point.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S097.20.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	General	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission point, as it has the potential to affect the consenting requirements of retirement villages. Ryman opposes any rules relating to financial contributions that allow 'double dipping' with Council's Development Contributions Policy, and that do not provide clarity as to contributions payable and do not take into account retirement villages' substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.	Disallow primary submission, and allow relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S097.20.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Amend as proposed by 097.20	Allow primary submission.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.21	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Waikanae	Oppose in part	Greater Wellington notes that some of the proposed new General Residential Zone in Waikanae is over existing stream corridors. Greater Wellington requests that the zone is removed from the stream corridors, and replaced with open space zone, with a setback of at least 5 m from the edge of the stream bed.  Any intensification in flood hazard zones will impact Greater Wellington's ability to discharge its flood risk management functions. Greater Wellington will need to maintain schemes, and potentially invest more in flood defence infrastructure. There will also be a need to introduce more sophisticated flood forecasting and warning systems to the region.  Intensification in any hazard zone is not in line with regional, national or international direction on hazards or climate change. Increasing densities within the Waikanae River flood plain will result in an increase to the vulnerability of people and property. An increase in vulnerability means an increase in risk.  Greater Wellington notes that the KCDC policy and rule framework guiding development is generally consistent with Greater Wellington's recommended approach to managing flood hazard risk. The flood overlays are also consistent with the plan controls development within flood hazard zones and the Regional Exposure Assessment 1% AEP map.  This request is sought by Greater Wellington to ensure the District Plan has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policies 29 and 51.	Remove river corridors from General Residential Zone, and amend to a more appropriate zoning, such as open space.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	No part of the General Residential Zone is located within any of the river corridors identified on the flood hazard layer in the District Plan maps. I therefore do not consider any amendments are necessary.  Regarding stream corridors (which are also raised in the submission), I note that the District Plan includes the following rules that restrict development in relation to stream corridors: - Buildings are a non-complying activity in stream corridors under rule NH-FLOOD-R17; - In addition to this, under rule NH-FLOOD-R2, buildings must be set back at least 10 metres from the natural bank of a stream more than 3 metres wide, and at least 5 metres from the natural bank of a stream less than 3 metres wide; - SUB-DW-Table 1 requires esplanade reserves or strips to be set-aside for subdivision adjacent to streams greater than 3 metres in width, with the reserve or strip width varying between 5 metres and 20 metres from the bank of the stream.  I therefore do not consider it appropriate to rezone parts of the General Residential Zone located in a stream corridor to Open Space Zone, on the basis that I consider that the District Plan already includes an appropriate range of restrictions on development in relation to stream corridors.	Do not accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.21.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.21.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.21.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.21.FS04	Lambert, William	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Natural hazards - amend PC2 to introduce a qualifying zone to allow for managed retreat and risk of natural hazards including inundation.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S101.FS.1	S097.21.FS05	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Toka Tu Ake considers that intensification and development should only occur in areas at minimal risk from natural hazards, and as such we support removal of residential zones from areas at higher risk. In this case, river and stream corridors pose higher flood hazard to life and property than ponding areas, as the flow rate and depth of water in a flood event is higher, and residential areas should not be zoned in areas which contain stream corridors.	Allow primary submission point.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S097.21.FS06	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.22	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support in part	Greater Wellington is aware that work is underway to update flood hazard maps in the District Plan. We request that the most up to date flood hazard information is used as a qualifying matter in the District Plan, to ensure that the intensification enabled by PC2 occurs in appropriate locations.	Ensure the most recent flood hazard maps are used as qualifying matters in the District Plan.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	The Council is in the process of reviewing its information on flood hazards as part of preparing for a future review of District Plan storm water and flood hazard management provisions. This includes a review of the Council's flood hazard models. While some updated models have been prepared as part of this, these are base data only and their use for district planning purposes has yet to be evaluated. I therefore consider that it would not be appropriate to use this data as part of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.22.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Support if it is suggesting MDRS be excluded from the DP by way of a qualifying zone for natural hazards including stormwater so that intensification occurs in appropriate areas.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.22.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Support if it is suggesting MDRS be excluded from the DP by way of a qualifying zone for natural hazards including stormwater so that intensification occurs in appropriate areas.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.22.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Support if it is suggesting MDRS be excluded from the DP by way of a qualifying zone for natural hazards including stormwater so that intensification occurs in appropriate areas.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.22.FS04	Lambert, William	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Support if it is suggesting MDRS be excluded from the DP by way of a qualifying zone for natural hazards including stormwater so that intensification occurs in appropriate areas.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S101.FS.1	S097.22.FS05	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Toka Tu Ake encourages the use and expansion of regulatory flood-hazard maps based on up-to-date modelling. If newer, more accurate estimates of flood extents are available, we support the Kapiti District Plan updating their regulatory flood overlays to reflect that research.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.3	S097.22.FS06	Landlink	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Support GWRC's request to ensure the most recent flood data (maps) are used as qualifying matters in the District Plan and note that it is important this data is accurate and readily available to the public.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S097.22.FS07	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Flood Hazard Overlays	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora opposes flood hazard maps being included within the District Plan. Kāinga Ora remain of the view that the flood hazard mapping should sit outside of the Plan as a non-statutory layer.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.22.FS08	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Flood Hazard Overlays	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.23	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O3	Support	Greater Wellington supports direction for developments to be centred around public transport rapid transit stops and encouraging people to live within Kapiti's existing urban environments, particularly where these are connected to transport. This will help Greater Wellington to meet goals set out in the Regional Public Transport Plan; such as the target of a 40% increase in mode shift to public transport by 2030; and improving customer experience through improving the accessibility of public transport for all. All new development should be designed with public transport and multi-modal travel in mind, to ensure residents and visitors are able to use modes other than private vehicles.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to DO-O3 in response to other submissions.	No.
S203.FS.1	S097.23.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Refer to NHO submission to pause development in Otaki until infrastructure is in place and to apply an Infrastructure Qualifying Matter. Note no Rapid Transit Stop yet.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.24	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O11	Support	Greater Wellington supports improved access to public and active modes of transport mentioned in the explanatory text. This will help Greater Wellington to meet goals set out in the Regional Public Transport Plan; such as the target of a 40% increase in mode shift to public transport by 2030; and improving customer experience through improving the accessibility of public transport for all.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	No.
S053.FS.1	S097.24.FS01	Waka Kotahi	DO-O11	Support primary submission	Waka Kotahi support that this objective should be retained as it will support modal shift and urban development goals.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.25	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P1, UFD-P4	Support	Greater Wellington supports UFD-P1 and its direction to integrate public services and infrastructure with growth. Greater Wellington supports increased housing densities within a walkable catchment of train stations, in that it supports an uptake of public transport use. This will help Greater Wellington to meet goals set out in the Regional Public Transport Plan; such as the target of a 40% increase in mode shift to public transport by 2030; and improving customer experience through improving the accessibility of public transport for all.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to these provisions in response to other submissions.	No.
S097	S097.26	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Wastewater provisions	Support in part	Greater Wellington supports the existing direction in the infrastructure chapter of the Operative District Plan, particularly to allow for greywater reuse systems and for wastewater systems to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment and maintain public safety. Greater Wellington also recognises that the Land Development Minimum Requirements have additional direction to subdivision on infrastructure requirements.  However, Greater Wellington considers that the District Plan should specifically provide for approved de-centralised alternative wastewater re-use and treatment (of both grey and black water) 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.  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. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(n), 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 and greenfield development.	Include direction in the District Plan, including infrastructure and subdivision provisions, to provide for de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using approved alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks, due to their existing issues with contamination and leaching) anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network should still be required.  This includes any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	The provision of on-site wastewater treatment systems is regulated for buildings under the Building Act 2004 through clause G13 of the New Zealand Building Code. In the District Plan, standards 10 of rule SUB-RES-Rx1 and standard 6 of rule SUB-RES-R27 provide standards for the provision of on-site waste water treatment systems, and these standards are consistent with those provided for under clause G13 of the Building Code.  However, in relation to "decentralised wastewater reuse and treatment... and disposal using alternative wastewater systems", I consider the scope and definition of these systems to be unclear. It is also unclear what technical standards these systems need to comply with, and whether these systems are consistent with the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code. In the absence of supporting evidence, and clear definition of the systems sought to be directed, I do not consider it appropriate for the District Plan to direct the use of these systems.  Notwithstanding this, I note that the District Plan does not discount alternative systems being considered through the resource consent process. In particular, I note that clause F(vi) of the <i>Land Development Minimum Requirements, April 2022</i> provides for the consideration of alternative systems on a case by case basis.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S097.26.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Wastewater provisions	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it recognises and provides for retirement villages.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.3	S097.26.FS02	Landlink	Wastewater provisions	Support primary submission	There should be opportunity to encourage innovations and for the adoption and utilisation of new treatment technologies. To add to the comment, it would also be good to include guidance about sludge disposal and WQ quality requirements for discharging to receiving environments.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S097.26.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Wastewater provisions	Support primary submission	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it recognises and provides for retirement villages.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S097.26.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Wastewater provisions	Support primary submission	As we experience growth and further residential and lifestyle block development in the District, our reticulated system is under significant pressure, and there is some time and further investment required to address this. It is helpful for the Plan to signal directions that set out the need for developments to consider and plan for decentralised wastewater systems. Further we suggest if not Plan provisions and guidance to set out the type of de-centralised wastewater systems that are appropriate in regards to Te Mana o te Wai.  Signal within PC2 directions that set out the need for developments to consider and plan for de-centralised wastewater systems. Alternatively, set out the type of de-centralised wastewater systems that are appropriate in regards to Te Mana o te Wai. This includes ongoing monitoring and maintenance requirements for those systems.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.26.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Wastewater provisions	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.27	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Greenhouse gas emission reduction - new provisions sought	Support in part	Policy CC.8 in Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks for activities regulated by the District Plan that relates to greenhouse gas emissions, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions.	Identify the type and scale of activities within the District Plan to which Policy CC.8 of Proposed RPS Change 1 applies.  Include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to prioritise reducing greenhouse gas emissions for the identified activities rather than applying emissions offsetting.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S097.27.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Greenhouse gas emission reduction – new provisions sought	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for. Ensure that the proposed amendments are consistent with Te Mana o te Wai	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.27.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Greenhouse gas emission reduction – new provisions sought	Support primary submission	Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.28	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support in part	Greater Wellington notes that PC2 proposes to intensify areas with limited existing infrastructure capacity, for example Paekākāriki which does not currently have reticulated wastewater. Greater Wellington seeks reassurance that infrastructure capacity will be appropriately managed to support the intensification, to mitigate potential adverse effects. Ensuring adequate three waters capacity for intensification gives effect to Operative and Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 58 and Policy FW.3 in Proposed RPS Change 1, particularly its direction on managing the effects of land use and development on drinking water and freshwater bodies.	Ensure that intensification is only enabled where it can be supported by sufficient three waters network capacity or alternative measures are available to mitigate potential adverse effects. See Greater Wellington's submission point on provision for approved alternative wastewater systems where there are constraints on the existing network capacity.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider that the District Plan can only make the requirements of the MDRS or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD less enabling of development if it is necessary to do so to provide for a qualifying matter, and I have outlined in section 4.2.5 of the body of the report why I do not consider infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter. In relation to the specific matter of the lack of Council reticulated wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki, I note that this is described in section 6.1.6 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report. In relation to the management of effects of discharges from on-site wastewater treatment systems on waterbodies (which is relevant to Paekākāriki), I consider that this matter is the responsibility of the Regional Council, which I note includes rules for such systems in the Regional Plan.	Do not accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.28.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Intensification should only occur where there is sufficient three waters network capacity, including stormwater disposal.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.28.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Intensification should only occur where there is sufficient three waters network capacity, including stormwater disposal.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.28.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Intensification should only occur where there is sufficient three waters network capacity, including stormwater disposal.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.28.FS04	Lambert, William	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Intensification should only occur where there is sufficient three waters network capacity, including stormwater disposal.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053.FS.1	S097.28.FS05	Waka Kotahi	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the changes. 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 Waka Kotahi agrees that infrastructure capacity should be managed, particularly in areas of proposed greenfield development	Allow primary submission in part. Waka Kotahi seeks to be involved with changes to the plan as a result of the submission point.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.3	S097.28.FS06	Landlink	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Partially support - high density in an area of high septic tank usage is not practical and the cumulative effects could be detrimental - more exploration is needed into this issue to ensure sustainable development.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S186.FS.1	S097.28.FS07	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S097.28.FS08	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Intensification in Paekākāriki and other areas without reticulated infrastructure networks	Support primary submission	See NHOO request for infrastructure qualifying matter for Ōtaki. Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.29	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General Residential Zone	Support in part	Greater Wellington 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.  Greater Wellington seeks for the provisions of the general residential zone and precincts 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.	<b>Ensure</b> the General Residential Zone provisions and residential design guide 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.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.30	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Rural zone provisions	Support in part	Greater Wellington seeks for the provisions of the zone to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 Policy 56.	<b>Ensure</b> the rural zone provisions have regard to Policy 56 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.31	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Commercial and mixed use zone provisions and Centres Design Guide in Appendix 2	Support in part	Greater Wellington seeks for the provisions across these 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.	<b>Ensure</b> the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone provisions and design guide 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.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S097.31.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Commercial and mixed use zone provisions and Centres Design Guide in Appendix 2	Support primary submission	<i>Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.32	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Open Space Zones	Support in part	Greater Wellington seeks for the provisions of the Open Space Zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	<b>Ensure</b> the Open Space 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.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S097.32.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Open Space Zones	Support primary submission	<i>Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.33	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Special Purpose Zones	Support in part	Greater Wellington seeks for the provisions of the Special Purpose Zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	<b>Ensure</b> the Special Purpose 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.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.34	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Future Urban zone	Support in part	Greater Wellington seeks for the provisions of the Future Urban Zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.  Greater Wellington seeks that the future urban zone gives effect to the NPS-FM by ensuring that freshwater bodies are required to be identified and protected during development planning.	<b>Ensure</b> the Future Urban 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.  <b>Ensure</b> future urban zone provisions have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 policies 55, UD.3 57 and 58 as required.  <b>Give effect</b> to the NPS-FM by ensuring that freshwater bodies are required to be identified and protected during development planning.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Refer to the body of the report.  I also consider that the protection of freshwater bodies during development planning is managed under the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NES-F), so I consider it unnecessary to amend PC2 to include provisions for this purpose.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S097.34.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Future Urban zone	Support primary submission	<i>Development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.35	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P11	Support	Greater Wellington supports amended Policy UFD-P11 retaining the consideration of natural character values, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.36	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRZ-P5	Support in part	Greater Wellington notes that natural character has not been retained in amended Policy GRZ-P5. In Greater Wellington's view, subdivision, use and development should seek to 'preserve' (rather than 'maintain') natural character in the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, to give effect to section 6(a) and NZCPS Policy 13.  Further, given an overall (or component level) natural character rating is comprised of biotic, abiotic and experiential values, it is Greater Wellington's view that reinstating the deleted version of clause 3 (regarding maintaining the natural character of vegetation) would not give effect to the direction of the relevant higher order planning documents. It is requested that KCDC amend GRZ-P5 to include an additional clause, to ensure Policy GRZ-P5 also considers the preservation of natural character, as opposed to maintaining natural character of vegetation, in isolation.	Greater Wellington requests <b>amendment</b> to proposed Policy GRZ-P5, by adding a fourth clause to ensure that subdivision, use and development in the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct also considers the protection of natural character.  Greater Wellington also notes that recognition of the cultural context and history of the area has been removed from this policy through the PC2 amendments, and we want to <b>ensure</b> that these values are still recognised appropriately across the District Plan.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	In relation to the protection of natural character in the coastal environment, refer to the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.36.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	GRZ-P5	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and special character should be a qualifying matter precinct.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.36.FS02	Tselentis, Evangella Leah	GRZ-P5	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and special character should be a qualifying matter precinct.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.36.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	GRZ-P5	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and special character should be a qualifying matter precinct.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.36.FS04	Lambert, William	GRZ-P5	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and special character should be a qualifying matter precinct.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.37	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MCZ-R15	Support	Greater Wellington supports retaining matter of discretion (2) in amended Rule MCZ-R15, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.38	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TCZ-R13	Support	Greater Wellington supports retaining matter of discretion (7) in amended Rule TCZ-R13, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.39	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support	Greater Wellington supports areas of high natural character being provided for as a matter of control (8) in new Rule SUB-resrx1, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.40	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R27	Support	Greater Wellington supports areas of high natural character being retained as a matter of control (8) in amended Rule SUB-RESR27, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.41	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-R12	Support	Greater Wellington supports retaining matter of discretion (7) in amended Rule MUZ-R12, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.42	Greater Wellington Regional Council	HOSZ-R9	Support	Greater Wellington supports retaining matter of discretion (7) in amended Rule HOSZ-R9, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.43	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R25	Support	Greater Wellington supports areas of high natural character being retained as a matter of control (4) in amended Rule SUB-RES-R25, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.44	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R26	Support	Greater Wellington supports areas of high natural character being retained as a matter of control (8) in amended Rule SUB-RES-R26, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.45	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R29	Support	Greater Wellington supports retaining matter of discretion (5) in amended Rule SUB-RESR29, as it has regard to proposed RPS Policy 3.	Retain as notified.	4.4.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Proposed RPS	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.46	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and UFD-P13	Support	Greater Wellington supports the inclusion of a coastal qualifying matter precinct to manage intensification while the community process under the Takutai Kāpiti programme is underway, and that any decisions on future subdivision, use and development will be subject to the outcomes of this process.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S074.FS.1	S097.46.FS01	Hazelton, Andrew	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and UFD-P13	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and the precinct should be enlarged to the entire coastal zone until KCDC has an effects based response to all matters of natural hazards in the coastal environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S097.46.FS02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and UFD-P13	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and the precinct should be enlarged to the entire coastal zone until KCDC has an effects based response to all matters of natural hazards in the coastal environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S097.46.FS03	Lambert, Nicholas	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and UFD-P13	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and the precinct should be enlarged to the entire coastal zone until KCDC has an effects based response to all matters of natural hazards in the coastal environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S097.46.FS04	Lambert, William	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and UFD-P13	Support primary submission	Support GWRC and the precinct should be enlarged to the entire coastal zone until KCDC has an effects based response to all matters of natural hazards in the coastal environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.47	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRZ-Px7	Support	This area is still under active discussion and consultation with the community under the Takutai Kāpiti programme and any decisions on future subdivision, use and development will be subject to the outcomes of this process. It is appropriate this area is exempt from the MDRS standards and NPS-UD P3.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.48	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRZ-R6	Support	It is acceptable that minor buildings, papakāinga and historic buildings are excluded from the rule governing development in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S097.48.FS01	Nga Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-R6	Support primary submission	Agree that minor buildings, papakāinga and historic buildings are excluded from the rule governing development in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Retain as notified.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097	S097.49	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TCZ-Px1	Support in part	It is acceptable that this area is exempt from the NPS-UD until the outcomes of the Takutai Kāpiti process are enacted, but it should also be excluded from the MDRS intensification standards.	Retain and include MDRS standards in point 2: "the level of subdivision and development otherwise required by the MDRS standards and policy 3 of the NPS-UD will not be enabled until the management of coastal hazards within the area is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change."	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I do not consider it necessary to reference the MDRS in policy TCZ-Px1, because the MDRS do not apply in the Town Centre Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.50	Greater Wellington Regional Council	LCZ-Px1	Support in part	It is acceptable that this area is exempt from the NPS-UD until the outcomes of the Takutai Kāpiti process are enacted, but it should also be excluded from the MDRS intensification standards.	Retain and include MDRS standards in point 2: "the level of subdivision and development otherwise required by the MDRS standards and policy 3 of the NPS-UD will not be enabled until the management of coastal hazards within the area is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change."	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I do not consider it necessary to reference the MDRS in policy TCZ-Px1, because the MDRS do not apply in the Town Centre Zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S097	S097.51	Greater Wellington Regional Council	LCZ-R20	Support	It is acceptable that this rule provides a non-complying status to buildings over 3 storeys until the outcomes of the Takutai Kāpiti process are enacted.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097	S097.52	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R26	Support	Greater Wellington supports inclusion of the Coastal Qualifying Matter.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.53	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support	Greater Wellington supports inclusion of the Coastal Qualifying Matter and hazards as a matter of control.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S097	S097.54	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R27	Support	Greater Wellington supports inclusion of the Coastal Qualifying Matter as a matter to exclude this area from the rule.	Retain as notified.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted.	Accept. Noting that I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	No.
S054.FS.1	S097.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support full submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S098	S098.01	Wiggs, Glen	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission provides a summary of the history of the development of Waikanae Beach, and the impacts of development on existing rivers, streams, lakes and swamps in the area. The present day consequence of this development is that the former swamp, river, stream and lake areas are prone to flooding. The submission also includes examples of recent inundation at Waikanae Beach and Peka Peka Beach.</p> <p>The submission notes that the Council is progressing a separate "Community Assessment Panel (CAP)" process to advise on the "medium to long term impacts of coastal erosion and inundation, and supports the approach taken by PC2 of dealing with erosion risk by including a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct until CAP completes its report on coastal hazards. Referring to policies 3, 24(d) and 25(b) of the NZCPS and section 6(h) of the RMA, the submission states that the same approach should be taken regarding inundation - specifically that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct should include all areas subject to inundation at Waikanae Beach and Peka Peka Beach and that no planning changes occur until CAP completes its report.</p> <p>The submission states that the Council has decided to use the Building Act 2004 to regulate the provisions of the Act (as it relates to inundation), and that this is inappropriate.</p> <p>The submission includes an estimate of the impact of inundation on roads and properties based on the KCDC Coastal Inundation Mapping Tool using various sea level rise scenarios. The submission states that the Olde Beach area and seaward part of South Waikanae Beach would be adversely affected low sea level rises and severely affected at higher levels. Inland South Waikanae Beach would be little affected (apart from access) because it is on higher ground. North Waikanae Beach would be affected only in parts, however ingress and egress would be affected.</p> <p>The 35% building coverage in the Beach Residential Zone reduces the risk of inundation from rain, as water can drain away naturally. If 50% coverage is permitted, then it would substantially increase the risk of flooding in heavy rain. The current drainage at Waikanae Beach is inadequate.</p>	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S098	S098.02	Wiggs, Glen	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 98.01.	Further or alternatively, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S098.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with reference to coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We agree with the reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps and Adaptation zones. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S098	S098.03	Wiggs, Glen	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 98.01.	Further or alternatively, amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include those areas at Waikanae Beach and Peka Peka Beach subject to inundation at 0.40m RSLR, 0.65m RSLR, 0.85m RSLR 1.25m RSLR or 1.65m RSLR on the KCDC Coastal Inundation Susceptibility Mapping Tool. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter E in the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend the spatial extent of PREC3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the General Residential Zone at Peka Peka Beach (refer section 19.8 and Appendix F of PC(R1)). Amend the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter (refer section 4.1 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report for details.
S098	S098.04	Wiggs, Glen	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 98.01.	Further, or alternatively amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include the current Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct at Waikanae Beach, and that accordingly all existing Beach Residential Precinct plan provisions continue to apply to the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach and the Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 be removed from the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S085.FS.2	S098.FS01	Houston, David	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support submission S098.01-04 and agrees with the details. Due to inundation and coastal erosion intensification is not appropriate.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S108.FS.1	S098.FS02	Yager, Graeme	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support the full submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S099	S099.01	Terry, John and Meads, Sarah	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Not specified	While PC2 does not propose to change the zoning of 155 to 205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka, this submissions opposes any rezoning that might be sought through submissions on PC2.  The submission states that the area of the Pharazyn Estate has been identified as environmentally and culturally significant in a variety of documents and contexts. These include: 1. An Environment Court decision that recognised that the area was a special and unique area containing the las major nature sand dune formation in the area, and placed consent notices on titles that restricted any further subdivision. 2. The Pharazyn Reserve Management Plan (2005). 3. The natural environment and cultural amenities are not suited to further subdivision. Factors include wāhi tapu and taonga, biodiversity, natural dunes, water supply constraints and sewerage constraints. 4. The KCDC Peka Peka Local Outcomes Statement (2012).	Retain the existing zoning of 155 to 205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S099.01.FS01	Nga Hapu o Otaki	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Support primary submission	NHoO do not support rezoning of lands at this time as per the points in the NHoO submission. Thorough site specific investigation is imperative before any rezoning. Govt and council intent of the NPS-UD is for growth in current residential urban areas. Lack of infrastructure and distance to supermarkets and other facilities. Some areas maybe subject to TOW claims. TOW hearings are occurring in this area now. This rezoning may comprise or unfairly render land unavailable for TOW settlements. Allowing intensification is out of step with TOW process. No driver to rush the future growth areas so is inappropriate. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S100	S100.01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O3 (including "Local Issues" section of explanatory text)	Support in part	Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for their people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract their people home as part of the growing population. Ātiawa support the focus on existing centres where life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs are provided. Ātiawa also support a proactive approach to responding to climate change including managed retreat and increased restrictions on development in high prone flood areas. In line with this, Ātiawa also support the identification of future new town centres that are removed from flood and liquefaction risk.  Ātiawa's concerns with the delivery of proposed development are discussed below in relation to the respective objectives, policies and rules. In regards to Clause 10, the submitter suggests instead of Council 'supporting reductions', development use should reduce greenhouse gas emissions and be resilient to the current and future effects of climate change by way of introducing Standards in the Plan.	Retain the proposed objective as notified.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Infrastructure	Not specified	Ātiawa oppose the enabling of development on the basis of "planned" infrastructure. It is critical that the provision of infrastructure is proactively managed to support development, in conjunction with or in advance of housing development. The reliance on another entity (the Regional Council) to deliver that infrastructure provides significant opportunity for a misalignment between the development enabled and the infrastructure delivered. The effects of such development will therefore not be adequately managed.  Ātiawa also note that there is a broad spectrum of what is considered 'infrastructure', and what of that is a genuine public good whose benefits are equitably distributed across the community, as opposed to other forms of infrastructure that are not necessarily public good, but rather benefit very distinct parts of the community.  Great care is therefore needed in defining infrastructure and considering how this aspect of a Plan would be implemented.	Amend Plan Change 2 to provide for infrastructure as a new qualifying matter.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S100.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-Ox1	Support in part	The submission notes that the urban environment forms part of the broader, interconnected environment. Therefore, in developing a "well-functioning urban environment" the wellbeing of the environment must be provided for.	Amend DO-Ox1 as follows:  <a href="#">A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</a>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100	S100.04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-Ox2, DO-O16, UFD-Px, UFD-P1, UFD-P4, TCZ-P6	Support in part	Ātiawa supports the objective of urban development as we seek to retain the ability for their people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract their people home as part of the growing population. The submitter supports development centred around public transport hubs and walkable catchments. However, the scale of that development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai, and ensure that the primary life-supporting values of rivers, and secondary values of human rights in relation to water is provided for before other tertiary economic and social values are provided for.	Ensure that the policies and rules resulting from this objective adequately provide for the land and water and Ātiawa's relationship with our sites and areas of significance, papakāinga, and marae.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	While I acknowledge the general points raised, I am unclear on the amendments to PC2 sought in relation to these matters.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.04.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-Ox2, DO-O16, UFD-Px, UFD-P1, UFD-P4, TCZ-P6	Support primary submission	Submitter supports DO-Ox2 urban development objective but notes that the scale of development needs to be planned and delivered in a way that recognises the rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and water. Any policy in relation to catchments and water also needs to be consistent with the hierarchy of obligations of Te Mana o te Wai. Greater Wellington agree with Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai and support the requested relief as this had regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Retain DO-Ox2 as notified and ensure that the supporting policies and rules provide for the relationship of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai with their land, water, sites and areas of significance, papakāinga and marae and policies that relate to catchments reflect Te Mana o te Wai.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.05	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support	The submission states that water is a taonga that must have its mana and wairua protected and enhanced. Ātiawa support the move away from the use of hard structures to provide storm and flood protection.	Retain Matter of Control 3 as notified.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.06	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	UFD-P13	Support	Refer to the following submission points for reasons.	Retain the Coastal Qualifying Matter and Marae takiwā Precincts in the General Residential Zone, within UFD-P13.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.07	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O3, DO-O11, UFD-P2	Oppose	The submission states that the proposal to have "regard to" or "encouraging" amenity values, which under section 2 of the RMA includes cultural values, does not achieve section 6 of the RMA. Section 6 states that in "achieving the purpose of this Act, ...shall recognise and provide for ... the relationship of Māori (e) and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga".  Ātiawa cultural values, provided for in s6 of the RMA, should not be compromised through the provisions of PPC2.	Oppose the amendment from "maintain, and where practicable, enhance" to "in a manner that has regard to", or "encouraging".  Amend Plan Change 2 to retain "maintain, and where practicable, enhance".	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S100.07.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O3, DO-O11, UFD-P2	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.08	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O11 Explanation	Oppose	The submission states that the proposal to have "regard to" or "encouraging" amenity values, which under section 2 of the RMA includes cultural values, does not achieve section 6 of the RMA. Section 6 states that in "achieving the purpose of this Act, ...shall recognise and provide for ... the relationship of Māori (e) and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga".  Ātiawa cultural values, provided for in s6 of the RMA, should not be compromised through the provisions of PPC2.	Include adequate recognition of the whakapapa and connection of Ātiawa to the land and water and the contribution this makes to the character of our rohe.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.08.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O11 Explanation	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.09	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	UFD-P3, UFD-P11	Oppose	The submission states that the proposal to "give consideration to" amenity values, which under section 2 of the RMA includes cultural values, does not achieve s6 of the RMA. Section 6 states that in "achieving the purpose of this Act, ...shall recognise and provide for ... the relationship of Māori and their (e) culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga".  Ātiawa cultural values, provided for in s6 of the RMA, should not be compromised through the provisions of PPC2.	Oppose the amendment from "Residential intensification will be managed to ensure that adverse effects on local amenity and character are avoided, remedied or mitigated ..." to "Residential intensification will give consideration to the effects of subdivision and development on character and amenity values, where these are provided for in the District Plan".  Amend Plan Change 2 to retain the existing policy wording.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.09.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P3, UFD-P11	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.10	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O11, UFD-P11, General Residential Zone: Introduction, MUZ-P1, MUZ-P4, MCZ-P5, TCZ-P3, LCZ-P3	Oppose	The submission states that Ātiawa has an enduring whakapapa relationship with the natural and physical environment. Their values, kaupapa and taonga are their enduring platform. The addition of the new text fails to recognise that relationship and their role as kaiaki.  The submission also states that the Residential and Centres Design Guidelines are proposed as a key mechanism for addressing amenity values, and notes that Ātiawa was not involved in the drafting of those documents and they do not recognise and provide for Ātiawa as required by s6 of the RMA. Therefore, the addition of the proposed text is required.	Amend relevant parts of Plan Change 2 as follows:  <a href="#">amenity values ... develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations, except where those values are cultural values</a>	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.10.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O11, UFD-P11, General Residential Zone: Introduction, MUZ-P1, MUZ-P4, MCZ-P5, TCZ-P3, LCZ-P3	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.11	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support	The submission states that management and provision for visual, character and amenity effects at this early, subdivision stage of development is likely to result in better outcomes than once subdivision has occurred.	Retain Matter of Control 2 as notified.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100	S100.12	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-P2	Support in part	Ātiawa supports subdivision, use and development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone being undertaken in accordance with our cultural values.  The submission also states that the Centres Design Guidelines are proposed as a key mechanism for addressing amenity, including cultural, values. Ātiawa was not involved in the drafting of those documents and they do not recognise and provide for Ātiawa as required by s6 of the RMA. Therefore, the addition of the proposed text is required.	Amend MCZ-P2 to add "and Ātiawa cultural values" to the matters that subdivision, use and development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone will be undertaken in accordance with.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.12.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MCZ-P2	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6.  The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e).  Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.13	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-P6, MCZ-P7, TCZ-P5, LCZ-P5	Support in part	Ātiawa supports mixed use development with high amenity values.  The Centres Design Guidelines is proposed as a key mechanism for addressing amenity, including cultural, values. Ātiawa was not involved in the drafting of those documents and they do not recognise and provide for Ātiawa as required by s6 of the RMA. Therefore, the addition of the proposed text is required.	Amend the policies to add "and mana whenua cultural values" to the matters that a high level of amenity will be achieved in accordance with.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.13.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-P6, MCZ-P7, TCZ-P5, LCZ-P5	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6.  The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e).  Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.14	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-P7, MCZ-P8, TCZ-P6, LCZ-P6	Support in part	Ātiawa supports subdivision, use and development being undertaken in accordance with our cultural values.  The Centres Design Guidelines is proposed as a key mechanism for addressing amenity, including cultural, values. Ātiawa was not involved in the drafting of those documents and they do not recognise and provide for Ātiawa as required by s6 of the RMA. Therefore, the addition of the proposed text is required.	Amend the policies to add "and mana whenua cultural values" to the matters that subdivision, use and development must be undertaken in accordance with.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.14.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-P7, MCZ-P8, TCZ-P6, LCZ-P6	Support primary submission	The submitter opposes the amendments to DO-O3, DO-O11 and UFD-P2 in how amenity values are addressed. In particular Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai state that under Section 2 of the RMA, amenity values includes cultural values and cultural values must also be provided for as required by Section 6. The submitter opposes a number of amendments which reduce the level of protection of amenity values and seeks to ensure that the Plan Change adequately provides for cultural values as required under Section 6.  The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of mana whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e).  Greater Wellington seeks that the amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(e) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values and pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.15	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Support in part	The submission states that the Financial Contributions chapter should provide for financial contributions in relation to the avoiding, remedying and mitigating of effects on cultural values.  The submission notes that the current text refers to the cultural values chapter of the plan. As there is no cultural values chapter this provides a lack of clarity and provision for cultural values.	Amend Plan Change 2 to include cultural values as a matter under "Financial contributions under this Plan may be required in respect of avoiding, remedying, mitigating or off-setting any adverse environmental effects on any or all of the following: ..."	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	I understand this to be reference to the "Historical and Cultural Values" chapter contained in Part 2 of the District Plan, which includes the Historic Heritage, Notable Trees and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori sections. I consider that it may be possible (given appropriate circumstances and purpose) for financial contributions to be a condition of consent for discretionary or non-complying activities under these provisions.  I consider that adverse effects on cultural values would fall within the scope of "adverse environmental effects", and where appropriate to the circumstances these could be considered in determining financial contributions. I therefore do not consider it necessary to amend the introductory text to specify cultural values.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.1	S100.15.FS01	Landlink	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Support primary submission	Support further exploration of financial contribution to be potentially used to support offsetting cultural values.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.16	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FC-Table x2	Support in part	The submission states that Ātiawa's vision is for its people to be able to live their lives in the rohe of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai in harmony with te taiao. This means there is a need to ensure the sustainable use of taonga and te taiao and that there are minimal impacts to our taonga and community through decision-making around development. Managing the effects of water supply systems, stormwater and wastewater disposal services and transport infrastructure on Ātiawa's cultural values is critical. That cost should be part of the financial contribution payable by the developer.	Amend the "Matters for consideration in determining level and/or nature of financial contribution" column as follows:  1. For "Water supply systems", "Stormwater disposal services" and "Wastewater disposal services":  <a href="#">The effect any additional connections may have on the existing system, cultural values, its users and/or on the quality and quantity of the supply.</a>  2. For "Transport infrastructure and access":  <a href="#">The sensitivity and location of activities and cultural values adjoining the transport corridor and adjacent to the subject site.</a>	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	In both cases I do not consider it necessary to identify effects on cultural values as a specific matter within the table, because they can already be considered under the broad definition of effects (or, in the case of 2, sensitivity to effects).	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S206.FS.1	S100.16.FS01	Landlink	FC-Table x2	Support primary submission	Support further exploration of financial contribution to be potentially used to support offsetting cultural values.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.17	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Papakāinga: Introduction	Support	Ātiawa support: - the purpose of this Chapter to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. - the recognition that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. - the acknowledgement of the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation.	Retain the Papakāinga chapter introduction as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.18	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-Ox4, DO-Ox5, DO-Ox6, DO-Ox7, DO-Ox8, DO-Ox9, DO-Ox10	Support	Ātiawa support the papakāinga objectives as they recognise papakāinga as a taonga and support their aspirations to strengthen their whakapapa connections to the rohe and to each other.	Retain the objectives as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.19	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px1, PK-Px2, PK-Px3, PK-Px4, PK-Px5, PK-Px6 (including advice notes)	Support in part	The submission states that it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. It would therefore be inappropriate to exclude papakāinga from being developed on the basis of planned infrastructure.	In the event that submission point S100.02 is accepted, amend PK-Px4 as follows: <a href="#">The maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development will be determined by the limitations of the site, including:</a> <a href="#">1. adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure to serve the papakāinga; and</a> <a href="#">2. adverse effects on adjoining properties and the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated;</a> <a href="#">while recognising that papakāinga may contain activities of a character, scale, intensity or range that are not provided for in the surrounding area.</a>	4.3 Papakāinga	I agree that planned infrastructure should be taken into account, however I consider it important that new development is integrated with planned infrastructure (particularly as it relates to the timing of any planned infrastructure). I therefore recommend that the words "integration with" are inserted before the term "planned infrastructure". I note that this wording would also be consistent with the amendments to clause 5 of policy UFD-P1 proposed by PC(N), which provides for new development to be integrated with planned infrastructure.	Accept in part. Recommend inserting alternative wording: "or integration with planned infrastructure". To improve interpretation as a result of other recommendations on this policy, I also recommend splitting out clause 1 of PK-Px4 into a list.	Yes. Amend PK-Px4. Refer section 3.1 of PC(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because I consider that providing for papakāinga development to be integrated with planned infrastructure is consistent with Objective 6(a) of the NPS-UD.
S100	S100.20	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Metropolitan Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone	Support in part	The submission states that Ātiawa have not finalised our Treaty of Waitangi Settlement with the Crown it is therefore inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from their rohe. Further, their relationship with their lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries. Therefore, in line with the purpose of this Chapter, which includes a range of activities including commercial activity, it is appropriate to enable papakāinga in all Zones.	Retain the provision for papakāinga in the General Residential, Town Centre, General Rural, Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle and Future Urban Zones. Amend Plan Change 2 to provide for papakāinga in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed Use Zones.	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Accept in relation to the Metropolitan Centre and Mixed Use Zones, accept in part in relation to the Local Centre Zone. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. - Add three new rules (MCZ-Rx1, MCZ-Rx2 and MCZ-Rx3) to the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 5.11 of PC2(R1). - Add three new rules (LCZ-Rx1, LCZ-Rx2 and LCZ-Rx3) to the Local Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 7.11 of PC2(R1). - Add three new rules (MUZ-Rx1, MUZ-Rx2 and MUZ-Rx3) to the Mixed Use Zone chapter. Refer section 8.10 of PC2(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S100.20.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Metropolitan Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone	Support primary submission	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai seek to enable papakāinga in all zones as it is inappropriate to exclude zones due to their treaty settlement not yet being finalised. Greater Wellington support provisions that would enable the development of papakāinga as this has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy UD.2. Include provision to enable the development of papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone and Mixed Use Zone.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.21	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRUZ-P9, RLZ-P8, RPROZ-P9, FUZ-P10	Support	The submission states that this is in accordance with the objectives of the papakāinga Chapter and tino rangatiratanga.	Retain the amendments to these policies as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.22	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRUZ-P11	Support in part	The submission states that it is implied, but unclear, that papakāinga is excluded from consistency with the principles.	Amend GRUZ-P11 so that papakāinga are excluded from consistency with principles 1-16 of the policy, in addition to the requirement for a structure plan.	4.3 Papakāinga	I agree that it is unclear whether papakāinga are excluded from the principles in the policy, or just the structure plan.  In light of the objectives for papakāinga, in particular DO-Ox4 and DO-Ox8, I consider it appropriate that papakāinga are excluded from the principles outlined in the policy, as sought by the submitter.	Accept.	Yes. Amend GRUZ-P11. Refer section 11.2 of PC(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to GRUZ-R11 is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 (in particular DO-Ox4 and DO-Ox8) and the purpose of the RMA than the notified provision, because it provides greater flexibility for tangata whenua to determine the form and appearance of papakāinga in the locations covered by the policy. I also consider it is a more appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, in particular s6(e).
S100	S100.23	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	CF-Px1, CF-R2, CF-Table 1, CF-R3	Oppose	The submission states that the Papakāinga Chapter recognises that papakāinga is inherently different from other development within the District. The inclusion of the community facilities policies and rules in relation to papakāinga is contrary to the intent of the papakāinga Chapter. Provision is made in the Papakāinga Chapter for papakāinga Design Guides and Development Plans.	Amend Plan Change 2 to remove the proposed references to papakāinga as part of the Community Facilities chapter.	4.3 Papakāinga	The purpose of amending the policies and rules of the Community Facilities chapter is to ensure that they are enabled as part of papakāinga development. This is relevant for papakāinga in rural zones, where community facilities are not otherwise enabled. Removing the proposed references to papakāinga as part of the Community Facilities chapter may result in community facilities as part of a papakāinga not being enabled in the rural zones.	Do not accept.	No.
S100	S100.24	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-R6, GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2, GRZ-Rx3, TCZ-R6, TCZ-R7, TCZ-R11	Support	The submission states that excluding papakāinga from these rules is in line with the intent of the Papakāinga objectives DO-Ox4-DO-Ox10. Ātiawa support papakāinga development in accordance with those objectives.	Retain the exclusion of papakāinga from these rules, as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.25	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx4, GRZ-R6, RPROZ-R6, GRUZ-R8, FUZ-R6	Support	The submission states that papakāinga include a wide range of activities that enable tino rangatiratanga. Commercial activity is therefore an integral part of papakāinga.	Retain these rules enabling papakāinga, including commercial activities, on land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 as notified.  Retain the provision for "The gross floor area of all commercial activities must not exceed the lesser of 20% of the area of the subject site, or 500m2" as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100	S100.26	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx9, TCZ-Rx2, GRUZ-Rx1, GRUZ-Rx2, RLZ-Rx1, RLZ-Rx2, RPROZ-Rx1, RPROZ-Rx2, FUZ-Rx1, FUZ-Rx2	Support in part	The submission states that the Standards, Matters of Discretion and Notes appropriately provide ensuring papakāinga is developed for those who whakapapa or have an ancestral connection to the land. It is appropriate that KCDC seeks advice from iwi authorities on matters related to tikanga Māori.	<b>Retain</b> the following parts of the rules as notified: - the Standards, Matters of Discretion and Notes (except as provided for under submission point S100.27). - public notification of this Restricted Discretionary Activity being precluded. - papakāinga at Whakarongotai Marae (Schedule of Historic Heritage ID: WTS0361A) being excluded from these rules in TCZ-Rx2.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.27	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx9, TCZ-Rx2, GRUZ-Rx1, GRUZ-Rx2, RLZ-Rx1, RLZ-Rx2, RPROZ-Rx1, RPROZ-Rx2, FUZ-Rx1, FUZ-Rx2	Support in part	The submission notes that, given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development.	<b>Amend</b> the Matters of Discretion for each rule to remove all reference to cumulative effects.	4.3 Papakāinga	I note that cumulative effects are not provided for as a matter of discretion under these particular rules. However, they are provided for under the rules raised by the submitter through submission point S100.32.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that the relief sought is provided for under S100.32.	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.28	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R6	Support in part	The submission states that Whakarongotai and papakāinga are integrally linked. The provision for papakāinga Design Guides and Development Plans.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-R6 to exclude papakāinga.	4.3 Papakāinga	TCZ-R6 already excludes papakāinga, so no amendment is necessary.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that no amendment is necessary because TCZ-R6 already excludes papakāinga.	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.29	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	RPROZ-R6, GRUZ-R8	Support in part	The submission states that as demonstrated by the requirement in RPROZ-R3, there are likely to be reverse sensitivity concerns between intensive farming and papakāinga. Where papakāinga are established, it is appropriate that adequate setbacks are also provided by intensive farming. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 it is appropriate to also require a 300 metre setback from this land so that future development potential is not prejudiced.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to provide that no intensive farming activity shall be located within 300 metres of a lawfully established papakāinga or land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.	4.3 Papakāinga	I note that under rules GRUZ-R11, RPROZ-R10, RLZ-R9 and FUZ-R9, intensive farming must be located at least 300m from the property boundary of any sensitive activity, and I consider that an established papakāinga would meet the definition of a sensitive activity. I consider that this aspect of the relief sought is already provided for by existing rules.  In relation to land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 that does not have a papakāinga or other sensitive activity on it, I cannot see a sufficient reason to require that intensive farming is set back from such land.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that existing rules already provide for intensive farming to be set back 300m from the property boundary of land that contains a papakāinga.	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.30	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	RLZ-R6, RPROZ-R6, GRUZ-R8	Support in part	The submission states that these rules require compliance with RPROZ-R3 and GRUZ-R3. Those rules require that "3. No buildings or structures (excluding minor buildings) within 500 metres of the inland edge of a beach shall be visible from the beach when measured from 1.5 metres vertically above ground level at a point 20 metres seaward from the seaward toe of the foredune."  The submission notes that this is unnecessary because effects will be managed through the papakāinga Design Guides and Development Plans.	<b>Amend</b> RLZ-R6, RPROZ-R6 and GRUZ-R8 to remove this setback requirement for papakāinga.	4.3 Papakāinga	This standard applies to all development within the rural zones, and as I understand it, it is intended to manage the effects of development on the natural character of the coastal environment adjacent to the rural zones.  While I appreciate the point made by the submitter, I am mindful that papakāinga design guides are yet to be developed. I also consider this standard to represent a "limitation of the site" as provided for under objective DO-Ox8. I therefore do not consider it appropriate to remove the requirement to comply with this standard.  I note that any effects associated with breaching this standard can be assessed through a resource consent process in the context of the particular papakāinga proposal, as a restricted discretionary activity under rules RLZ-Rx2, RPROZ-Rx2 and GRUZ-Rx2.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.31	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx10, TCZ-Rx3, GRUZ-Rx2, RLZ-Rx2, RPROZ-Rx2, FUZ-Rx2	Support in part	The submission states that the purpose of the papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation.	<b>Retain</b> the following parts of the rules as notified: - the Standards, Matters of Discretion and Notes (except as provided for under submission point S100.27). - public notification of this Restricted Discretionary Activity being precluded.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.32	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx10, TCZ-Rx3, GRUZ-Rx2, RLZ-Rx2, RPROZ-Rx2, FUZ-Rx2	Support in part	The submission notes that, given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development.	<b>Amend</b> the Matters of Discretion for each rule to remove all reference to cumulative effects.	4.3 Papakāinga	I agree that it is unnecessary to provide for cumulative effects as a matter of discretion, but for a different reason to that identified by the submitter. "Cumulative effects" is to broad a matter of discretion, and cumulative effects associated with the effects of a standard not met (under matter of discretion 1) can be considered s104(1)(a) as an actual or potential effect in any case.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend: - GRZ-Rx10 (refer section 4.35 of PC(R1)) - TCZ-Rx3 (refer section 6.15 of PC(R1)) - GRUZ-Rx2 (refer section 11.6 of PC(R1)) - RLZ-Rx2 (refer section 12.4 of PC(R1)) - RPROZ-Rx2 (refer section 13.4 of PC(R1)) - FUZ-Rx2 (refer section 14.4 of PC(R1))  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider the amendments to these provisions a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA than the notified provisions, because it provides for a more efficient set of restricted discretionary activity rules by removing an unnecessary matter of discretion.
S100	S100.33	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-Rx1, TCZ-Rx2	Support in part	The submission states that these provisions currently refers to Standards 1, 2, 3 and 13 under Rule TCZ-R6 which unnecessarily limits papakāinga development as the reverse sensitivity effects will be managed through the papakāinga Design Guides and Development Plans.  The submission notes that Standard 13 requires buildings and structures in the Town Centre Zone to be setback 4 metres from the boundary of any Residential Zone. As papakāinga can also be developed in the Residential Zone, applying this Town Centre Zone requirement is not consistent with the management of effects - It is unduly restricting papakāinga.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-Rx1 and TCZ-Rx2 so that papakāinga are enabled to the same extent as other Town Centre Zone development.	4.3 Papakāinga	I note that the proposed papakāinga provisions enable papakāinga development to a greater degree than other (non-papakāinga) development within the Town Centre Zone. Non-papakāinga development in the Town Centre Zone is required to comply with all standards under rule TCZ-R6, however, under TCZ-Rx1 and TCZ-Rx2, papakāinga need only comply with standards 1, 2, 3 and 13 under TCZ-R6 (which relate to the building height, boundary setbacks and height in relation to boundary). Standard 13 specifically requires all development in the Town Centre zone to be set back 4 metres from the boundary with the Residential Zone.  The general approach to the papakāinga provisions is to provide that the boundary setback provisions for development in the underlying zone also apply to papakāinga, to ensure that effects at the boundary are managed in a consistent manner. This is consistent with the approach to papakāinga in all other zones where they are enabled. On this basis, I consider it appropriate that standard 13 applies to papakāinga development.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100	S100.34	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRUZ-R15	Support	The submission notes that this is consistent with the objectives of papakāinga.	Retain the amendments to GRUZ-R15 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.35	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRUZ-R19, RLZ-R14, RPROZ-R16, FUZ-R14	Support	The submission notes that this is consistent with the objectives of papakāinga.	Retain the amendments to GRUZ-R19, RLZ-R14, RPROZ-R16 and FUZ-R14 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.36	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRUZ-R20, RLZ-R15, RPROZ-R17, FUZ-R15	Support	The submission notes that this is consistent with the objectives of papakāinga.	Retain the amendments to GRUZ-R20, RLZ-R15, RPROZ-R17, FUZ-R15 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.37	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	RLZ-R15, RPROZ-R17, FUZ-R15	Support	The submission notes that this is consistent with the objectives of papakāinga.	Retain the amendments to RLZ-R15, RPROZ-R17, FUZ-R15 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.38	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-Rx3	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain TCZ-Rx3 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.39	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R11	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain the amendments to TCZ-R11 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.40	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-P1	Support in part	The submission notes that as Ātiawa have not finalised their Treaty of Waitangi Settlement with the Crown it is inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from their rohe. Further, their relationship with their lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries. Therefore, in line with the purpose of this Chapter, which includes a range of activities including commercial activity, it is appropriate to enable papakāinga in all Zones.	Amend Plan Change 2 to enable papakāinga in the Local Centre Zone.	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Add three new rules (LCZ-Rx1, LCZ-Rx2 and LCZ-Rx3) to the Local Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 7.11 of PC2(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S100.40.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	LCZ-P1	Support primary submission	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai seek to enable papakāinga in all zones as it is inappropriate to exclude zones due to their treaty settlement not yet being finalised. Greater Wellington support provisions that would enable the development of papakāinga as this has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy UD.2. Include provision to enable the development of papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone and Mixed Use Zone.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.41	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-P1	Support in part	The submission notes that as Ātiawa have not finalised their Treaty of Waitangi Settlement with the Crown it is inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from their rohe. Further, their relationship with their lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries. Therefore, in line with the purpose of this Chapter, which includes a range of activities including commercial activity, it is appropriate to enable papakāinga in all Zones.	Amend Plan Change 2 to enable papakāinga in the Mixed Use Zone.	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	Yes. Add three new rules (MUZ-Rx1, MUZ-Rx2 and MUZ-Rx3) to the Mixed Use Zone chapter. Refer section 8.10 of PC2(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S100.41.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-P1	Support primary submission	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai seek to enable papakāinga in all zones as it is inappropriate to exclude zones due to their treaty settlement not yet being finalised. Greater Wellington support provisions that would enable the development of papakāinga as this has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy UD.2. Include provision to enable the development of papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone and Mixed Use Zone.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.42	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	NOISE-R22	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain acoustic standard requirements for papakāinga as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.43	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition: ANCESTRAL LAND	Support in part	The submission notes that this is consistent with the intent of papakāinga.	Amend the proposed definition of ANCESTRAL LAND to the following definition (including any consequential amendments):  <u>Ancestral Land means land where tangata whenua have an undisturbed collective whakapapa relationship.</u>	4.3 Papakāinga	Section 32 Evaluation Report (p.67), notes that the definition of the term "ancestral land" used in PC2 is intentionally broad, and based on interpretation of the term developed through case law. The intention of this is to avoid the District Plan being overly prescriptive about what the term means, to allow tangata whenua sufficient scope to appropriately define their specific relationship to the land in the circumstances of the case. I acknowledge that whakapapa is a core component of the relationship between tangata whenua and ancestral whenua, and I note that whakapapa, in relation to ancestral land that is general title land, is acknowledged in policy PK-Px1.  I am concerned that use of the term "undisturbed" in the definition requested by the submitter may be interpreted in a manner that rules out land that had been alienated in the past, but has since been reacquired by tangata whenua, from being considered as ancestral land. I am concerned that, where it is interpreted in this manner, this may make it more challenging for tangata whenua to obtain resource consent to develop papakāinga development on general title land that they may have lost in the past, but since reacquired, and I consider this would be inconsistent with objective DO-Ox4 (which seeks to enable tangata whenua to live on their ancestral land).  I make this recommendation cautiously, mindful that I interpret this issue from the perspective of a Pākehā practitioner, and mindful that I have not been able to discuss this matter with Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. The submitter may wish to express their position on this matter at the hearing.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S100.43.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Definition: ANCESTRAL LAND	Support primary submission	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai seek the definition of ancestral land is amended. Greater Wellington support the proposed definition.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.44	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition: GENERAL TITLE LAND (IN RELATION TO PAKĀINGA)	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain the definition as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.45	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition: PAKĀINGA	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain the definition as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100	S100.46	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition: QUALIFYING MATTER AREA	Support in part	The submission states that the intent behind the listing order of qualifying matters is unclear.	<b>Amend</b> the definition to list each qualifying matter alphabetically, or to clearly state that the matters are not listed in order of priority.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	The matters are listed in the order that they appear in the District Plan, and are not listed in order of priority. I acknowledge the concern raised and consider it appropriate to add a note to the definition that clarifies that the matters are not listed in order of priority.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA (refer section 20.11 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it clarifies the definition and provides for more effective interpretation.
S100	S100.47	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition: TINO RANGATIRATAN GA	Support	No specific reasons given.	<b>Retain</b> the definition as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.48	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition: TIPUNA/TUPUNA	Support	No specific reasons given.	<b>Retain</b> the definition as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.49	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FC-R5	Support in part	The submission states that identifying land to be provided to Council as a financial contribution provides a significant opportunity, in Ātiawa's role as kaitiaki, to enable their reconnection with sites or areas of significance that are not currently adequately provided for.	<b>Amend</b> FC-R5 to add a note for this rule that the location and area of land specified by the Council as a financial contribution (provided for under standard 3(d)(i)) will be identified in consultation with tangata whenua.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	I agree that there may be circumstances where it is appropriate for Council to seek the advice of iwi authorities in relation to the location of land. I consider "seek the advice of" to be a more appropriate term than "consult", as this avoids the potential inference that the iwi authority is being notified as an affected person in the resource consent process (which they may not be in all circumstances).	<b>Accept in part.</b> Using the term "seek the advice of" in lieu of "consult".	<b>Yes.</b> Amend FC-R5 (refer section 15.3 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it would assist the Council with meeting its obligations under Policy 9(c) of the NPS-UD.
S100	S100.50	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Support in part	The submission supports the recognition of Kārewarewa Urupā for detailed reasons identified in the submission. Refer to pages 19-21 of the original submission for full reasons.  In addition to this, the submission identifies that the boundaries of the wāhi tapu are intended to reflect the original surveyed boundaries of the urupā, however, the extent of the south eastern edge of the urupā as shown in Appendix E of the IPI is not consistent with the surveyed boundary. Effects on that portion of the wāhi tapu will therefore not be adequately managed. Therefore the extent of the wāhi tapu should be extended to be consistent with Figure 3 of the submission.	<b>Retain</b> Kārewarewa Urupā as Wāhanga tahi and Wāhanga rua through amendments to Schedule 9 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori in the "Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure and Districtwide" map series.  <b>Amend</b> the southwestern boundary of WTSx1 - Kārewarewa Urupā (Wāhanga Tahi) to include Lot 4 as per the Ngarara West A14B1 block surveyed boundary as shown in figure 3 of the submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Refer section 19.7 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S104.FS.1	S100.50.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S100.50.FS02	Nghā Hapū o Ōtaki	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Support primary submission	NHoO support the TAA position and submission regarding Kārewarewa Urupā.	Allow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.51	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General Residential Zone: Introduction, Town Centre Zone: Introduction	Support	The submission notes that the purpose of the Marae takiwā Precinct is to: "recognise that the cultural and traditional practices that occur at marae are likely to be sensitive to the effects of surrounding development. The precinct seeks to manage these effects by providing for a lower level of development to occur adjacent to marae as a permitted activity. Where development breaches permitted activity standards, it must avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the cultural values and tikanga Māori associated with the marae, and the use and function of the marae."  The submission states that marae are our taonga. Ātiawa support the recognition that their practices are sensitive to the effects of the surrounding development and that the objective is to manage these effects by providing for a lower level of development to occur adjacent to marae as a permitted activity.	<b>Retain</b> the inclusion and purpose of the Marae Takiwā Precinct as notified.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.52	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Px8	Support	The submission identifies that the development of two storey buildings within the General Residential Zone will support the purpose of the Precinct and manage impacts on Whakarongotai.	<b>Retain</b> the matters to be avoided, remedied and mitigated, as notified. <b>Retain</b> the policy providing for buildings up to 2-storeys, as notified.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.53	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-Px2	Support in part	The submission states that the wellbeing of Whakarongotai is currently impacted by the surrounding development. Any further development will intensify those impacts including on our ability to connect with Kapakapanui. In recognition of the partnership between KCDC and Ātiawa, and the process through which KCDC came to be in possession of that land, Ātiawa considers it appropriate that no further height development occurs on TCZ land within the Marae takiwā Precinct.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 so that the land surrounding Whakarongotai, in the ownership of KCDC managed entities, is restricted to the current developed height. For all other TCZ land within the Marae Takiwā Precinct, retain the policy providing for buildings up to 3-storeys.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	In my opinion, an approach that applies different height standards within the precinct based on land ownership is difficult to justify based on the potential effects of development (in other words, the effects of a three storey building are the same regardless of whether the Council owns the land underneath it).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.54	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	UFD-P13	Support	The submission supports the Marae takiwā being included as a precinct in the General Residential Zone.	<b>Retain</b> the identification of the Marae Takiwā Precinct as part of UFD-P13 as notified.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.55	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx1	Support	The submission states that the proposed rules provided in GRZ-Rx3 will more effectively manage the effects of development on Whakarongotai.	<b>Retain</b> the exclusion of the Marae Takiwā Precinct from the GRZ-Rx1, as notified.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.56	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R6	Support in part	The submission states that the wellbeing of Whakarongotai is currently impacted by the surrounding development. Any further development will intensify those impacts including on our ability to connect with maunga, including Kapakapanui. In recognition of the partnership between KCDC and Ātiawa, and the process through which KCDC came to be in possession of that land, Ātiawa considers it appropriate that no further height development occurs on TCZ land within the Marae takiwā Precinct.	<b>Retain</b> the rule that buildings and structures in the Marae Takiwā Precinct shall be no more than 3 storeys above the original ground level, except where the land is owned by a KCDC entity then no further development shall occur. <b>Retain</b> the rules limiting the height to boundary envelope in the Marae Takiwā Precinct.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted. With respect to the request to restrict development on Council owned sites, refer to my assessment under S100.53.	<b>Accept in part.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.57	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R6	Not specified	The submission states that Whakarongotai and papakāinga are integrally linked. The provision for papakāinga, Design Guides and Development Plans developed by tangata whenua will adequately address any potential reverse sensitivity.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-R6 to exclude papakāinga.	4.3 Papakāinga	TCZ-R6 already excludes papakāinga, so no amendment is necessary.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that no amendment is necessary because TCZ-R6 already excludes papakāinga.	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.58	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R11	Support	The submission notes that buildings and structures within the Marae Takiwā Precinct are better managed under TCZ-Rx4 as proposed.	<b>Retain</b> the exclusion of buildings and structures within the Marae Takiwā Precinct from TCZ-R11.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100	S100.59	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R11	Support	The submission states that Papakāinga are better managed under TCZ-Rx3 as proposed.	<b>Retain</b> the exclusion of papakāinga from TCZ-R11.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100	S100.60	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Rx8	Support	The submission states that the effects on cultural values and tikanga Māori and the effects on the use and function of the marae should be considered for development within the Marae takiwā Precinct. Ātiawa should be considered an affected person in accordance with section 95E of the RMA and notified of the application, where written approval is not provided. Council should seek advice from the relevant iwi authority and will rely on this advice.	Retain the Matters of Discretion and Notes under rule GRZ-Rx8.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	Accept. Noting that I have recommended an amendment to the rule to correct a minor error under cl 16(2) of Schedule 1 to the RMA.	No.
S100	S100.61	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-Rx4	Support	The submission states that Ātiawa's Marae is their ancestral home. Its relationship within the wider landscape is critical to Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. Therefore, Ātiawa are affected by development adjacent to Whakarongotai and it is only Ātiawa who can advise the nature and scale of those effects.	Retain the matters of discretion and notes under rule GRZ-Rx4.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.62	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx6 - Marae Takiwā Precinct (General Residential Zone)	Not specified	The submission supports the submission of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203).	Refer submission S203.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Refer S203.37.	Refer S203.37.	Refer S203.37.
S100	S100.63	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PRECx7 - Marae Takiwā Precinct (Town Centre Zone)	Support in part	The submission states that Frater Place forms an integral part of Whakarongotai.	Amend the extent of the Marae wāhi tapu as shown on Map 10 Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure, Districtwide to include Frater Place.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I understand Frater Lane to be Council road reserve and not private property. Extending the Whakarongotai Marae wāhi tapu (WTS0361) to include Frater Lane would extend the Wāhanga Wha provisions in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter of the District Plan to cover the land. This principally requires (under rule SASM-R5) an accidental discovery protocol for land disturbance and earthworks, and that additions or alterations to buildings do not include a basement or in-ground swimming pool. I consider these provisions to be reasonable and not unduly restrictive in relation to the road reserve.	Accept.	Yes. Refer section 19.6 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it recognises and provides for a matter of national importance under section 6 of the RMA.  I consider this to be a qualifying matter under section 77O(a) of the RMA, because it relates to matters of national importance under sections 6(e) and (f). While I consider it unlikely that the level of development provided for by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD would occur on road reserve, were it to occur, I consider this level of development would be inappropriate in the absence of the SASM provisions in this case. I consider that this will have a negligible impact on the provision of development capacity. As a result, I consider the costs to be negligible, but the broader impacts positive, particularly with respect to the relationship between Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai and Whakarongotai marae.
S100	S100.64	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Town Centre Zone	Support	Ātiawa support the Takutai Kapiti process to ensure appropriate management of coastal hazards and the coastal environment. Until such time as that process has completed, Ātiawa supports the policy of not enabling further development in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	Retain the provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as notified.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S100.64.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Town Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support the policy of not enabling further development in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Retain the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as notified.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.65	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-Px7, TCZ-Px1, LCZ-Px1	Support	Ātiawa support the Takutai Kapiti process to ensure appropriate management of coastal hazards and the coastal environment. Until such time as that process has completed, Ātiawa supports the policy of not enabling further development in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	Retain the policies as notified and all consequential rules.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100	S100.66	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	GRZ-R6	Support	The submission supports papakāinga being excluded from the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct rules which limits development. Provision is made in the papakāinga Chapter for papakāinga Design Guides and Development Plans to manage development on those sites.	Retain the exclusion of papakāinga from GRZ-R6 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S100.66.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-R7	Support primary submission	Support papakāinga being excluded from the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct rules which limit development. Retain the exclusion of papakāinga from GRZ-R6 as notified.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.67	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose	The submission notes that the effects of climate change are evident in the District. It is therefore inappropriate to enable intensification in this area.	Amend Plan Change 2 to extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct requirements to prevent any further subdivision in this precinct.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	As stated in the Section 32 Evaluation Report, the purpose of the precinct is "to maintain the status quo level of development enabled by the provisions of the operative District Plan in the relevant area, to ensure that the management of coastal hazards can be appropriately addressed through the future coastal environment plan change process". The provisions in SUB-RES-Table x1 provide for existing minimum allotment size and shape factors in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to be retained. I consider this to be consistent with the purpose of the precinct, and do not consider it appropriate to amend PC2 to prevent further subdivision in this area.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S100.67.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES-Table x1	Support primary submission	Agree that the effects of climate change are evident in the District. We agree it is inappropriate to enable intensification in this area. Agree to the recommendation of Plan Change 2 to extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct requirements to prevent any further subdivision in the precinct.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.68	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Existing qualifying matters	Not specified	The submission states that the provisions in the existing Qualifying Matters are outdated and do not adequately provide for Ātiawa's relationship with their lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga. This is particularly concerning in the context of the proposed intensification where additional pressure will be exerted.	Retain the existing qualifying matters. Further develop the provisions to ensure their appropriate management of effects.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that further developing the provisions related to existing qualifying matters would require a review of these provisions, and sufficient evidence to support any proposed amendments. While I do not consider it to be appropriate based on the available information to further develop the provisions as part of this plan change, I note that the Council is separately preparing several plan changes that provide the opportunity to engage further on the development of provisions related to existing qualifying matters.	Accept in part. In relation to retaining provisions related to existing qualifying matters, noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of PC2.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S100.68.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Existing qualifying matters	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We acknowledge that our coastal environments will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We agree that the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District to be landward boundary of the areas shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100	S100.69	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Design Guides	Not specified	The submission notes that Ātiawa was not involved in the development of the Design Guides. The submission states that Ātiawa's approach to growth is grounded in and guided by their mātauranga, thus recognising the rangatiratanga of hapu and iwi, applying the enduring wisdom of kaupapa Māori and enhancing the unique identity and culture of this place. Proactive initiatives are required to ensure that our unique history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the District. The Design Guides are a key mechanism in giving effect to our kaupapa (values), huanga (vision) through our tikanga (approach) as expressed in Whakarongotai o te moana, Whakarongotai o te wa.	Develop and include design criteria that reflect our values. Establish a design panel with tangata whenua representation to adequately assess the design of development.	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S206.FS.1	S100.69.FS01	Landlink	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Support that design guides should reflect values that are important to tangata whenua for consideration during development.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S244.FS.1	S100.FS01	McDonald, Deidre	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support their request for a 'mana enhancing' Treaty partnership with KDCDC and their concern that there is no 'life sustaining infrastructure' in place to support this proposal. This needs to include consideration of physical health care, mental health services and extra policing support for this new and growing community.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S100.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission. The mental health of homeless and badly housed people is very important, as is the mental health of people currently living on the Kapiti Coast. Neither group should take precedence. All people need access to housing, services, social connections, and places to spiritually replenish.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S101	S101.01	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Definition: Qualifying Matter Areas	Not specified	The Kapiti Coast is at risk from numerous natural hazards including fault rupture, flooding and coastal erosion, which are provided in the plan change; and tsunami and liquefaction, which are not.  Toka Tū Ake EQC support the use of qualifying matters to avoid residential intensification in flood hazard and fault avoidance zones in Proposed Plan Change 2. Toka Tū Ake EQC also support the creation of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to avoid intensification of land at risk of coastal erosion until further environmental plans can be made.  Research suggests that the percentage of people who choose to evacuate and the speed at which they evacuate could lead to many deaths and injuries if a major tsunami were to occur. Evacuation modelling by GNS Science indicates that there are Kapiti Coast settlements from which it may take 30 minutes to an hour for a person to evacuate to outside the tsunami hazard zone at average walking speed.	Amend the definition of "Qualifying matter areas" to include liquefaction hazard.	4.10.2 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Liquefaction	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S101.01.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition: Qualifying Matter Areas	Oppose primary submission	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 as a Qualifying Matter. 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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.2 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Liquefaction	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S101	S101.02	Toka Tū Ake EQC	District Plan Maps - Hazards and Risks	Not specified	See submission point S101.01.	Add district planning maps to include Greater Wellington liquefaction hazard maps as a district overlay.	4.10.2 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Liquefaction	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S101.02.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	District Plan Maps - Hazards and Risks	Oppose primary submission	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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.2 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Liquefaction	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S101	S101.03	Toka Tū Ake EQC	Tsunami	Not specified	See submission point S101.01.	Add provisions to the District Plan to restrict Buildings of Importance Category (BIC) or higher in areas at highest risk of tsunami inundation and in those areas which are more difficult to evacuate.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I note that the original submission referred to "Buildings of Importance Category (BIC) 3 or higher", and this should have been reflected in the Summary of Decisions requested.  I do not consider it appropriate to add rules to the District Plan as part of PC2 that regulate development in areas at high risk of tsunami, as this would be contrary to policy NH-EQ-P18, which states that "there will be no regulatory controls placed on development in high risk areas for tsunami in this plan). In addition to this, while I acknowledge that the submission includes information about tsunami evacuation times from various parts of the District, it is not clear to me what would be an appropriate spatial extent to determine those areas that are "at highest risk of tsunami inundation". Were it considered to be appropriate to manage this hazard through regulatory controls in the District Plan, then I consider that an appropriate evidence base would be required to amend existing policy NH-EQ-P18, as well as to spatially identify the parts of the District where the hazard would be managed through District Plan controls.  In any case, in relation to PC2 I consider that the majority of development enabled by PC2 is unlikely to be classified as BIC 3 or higher (and I rely on the descriptions contained in table NH-EQ-Table 2 in the operative District Plan to make this observation). I note table NH-EQ-Table 2 indicates that BICs 1 and 2 include building types up to and including multi-occupancy residential, commercial and industrial buildings, which I consider are likely to be the majority of building types enabled by PC2.  I note that my assessment and recommendation in on this matter relates to PC2 only, and it should in no way constrain consideration of this matter as part of any future plan change.	Do not accept.	No.
S122.FS.1	S101.03.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Tsunami	Oppose primary submission	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.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S244.FS.1	S101.FS01	McDonald, Deidre	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support full submission. In particular, support their submission that qualifying matters should be relied on to 'avoid residential intensification in flood hazard and fault avoidance zones' in the proposed plan change (intensification).	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S102	S102.01	Hollett, Stephen	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.</p> <p>The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.</p> <p>The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.</p> <p>The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.</p> <p>The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.</p> <p>The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.</p>	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S102.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that PC2 includes a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.</p> <p>Recommend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be landward boundary of the areas shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S102	S102.02	Hollett, Stephen	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.</p> <p>The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level rise and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.</p>	If submission S102.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S102.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree to the reference of the Takutai Kāpiti and Adaptation Zones. We realise that Adaptation Zones are coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions.</p> <p>The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S102	S102.03	Hollett, Stephen	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S102.01 and S102.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S102	S102.04	Hollett, Stephen	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S102.01 and S102.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S103	S103.01	Breese, Steve	General	Support	The submission supports the changes in their entirety, but wonders whether they go far enough. The submission questions why the "garden area" still exists. The submission notes that they have not been able to subdivide their section.	Approve Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Subject to recommendations to amend PC(N) made throughout this document.	No.
S104	S104.01	Waikanae Land Company	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose	<p>The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The subject land is not the Kārewarewa Urupā.</li> <li>- The s32 analysis on which the Wāhi Tapu listing is based is deficient and wrong.</li> <li>- The submitters opposition is based on independent, objective, expert assessments that refute the subject land is Kārewarewa Urupā.</li> <li>- The subject land is zoned for residential use, and should be subject to District Plan provisions that enable and encourage residential structures and activities.</li> <li>- It is inefficient and inappropriate for Council to notify the Wāhi Tapu listing pending the outcome of existing Environment Court proceedings that may authoritatively determine whether the subject land (or at least part of it) is the Kārewarewa Urupā.</li> <li>- The Wāhi Tapu listing is ultra vires, being an improper use of an Intensification Planning Instrument.</li> </ul>	Delete the proposed amendments to Schedule 9 and the District Plan maps (and such further or consequential relief as may be necessary to address the matters raised in this submission).	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S104.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	Kārewarewa urupā has been used for the interment of both members of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa ki te tonga, Ngāti Toarangatira, and the Pākehā settler community. Members of Ātiawa have been on record since 1896 consistently testifying that it is an urupā and a wāhi tapu. Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai would be horrified if housing development was allowed to continue at the urupā/cemetery. The history of Kārewarewa urupā is a dark reflection of previous councils and governments failure to protect the interests of Māori, and the wider community. The opportunity provided through this District Plan process is for Council to go some way to setting this legacy right, and demonstrate a more enlightened and faithful approach to how it informs land use on the Kāpiti Coast. While Kārewarewa Urupā is already a wāhi tapu, for policy purposes it is proposed to recognise this through listing it in Schedule 9- Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori of the District Plan. This means it will be appropriately recognised as a new qualifying matter (under s771 and s770 of the RMA). Retain Kārewarewa urupā as Wāhanga tahi and Wāhanga rua through amendments to Schedule 9 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori the "Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure and Districtwide" map series. The boundary of WTSx1 – Kārewarewa Urupā (Wāhanga Tahi) is extended to include Lot 4 as per the Ngarara West A14B1 block surveyed boundary shown in Figure 3 of our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S104.01.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	We oppose this submission it is inappropriate for development to occur on this land as it is a wāhi tapu and will need to be recognised in the Plan in Schedule 9 and the District Plan maps. These changes in the District Plan are a work in progress and the site will be included in the Schedule for Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori which will make the site a qualifying matter under the IPI legislation, this means that it is inappropriate such amendment to be considered.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S104.01.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	NHoO support the TAA position and submission regarding Kārewarewa Urupā	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S104	S104.02	Waikanae Land Company	General	Oppose	See submission point S104.01.	Alternatively, or in combination with the deletion sought in submission point S104.01, amend PC2 so that the District Plan provides some combination of objectives, policies, rules and/or other methods that provide for residential development of the land in accordance with Medium Density Residential Standards (and such further or consequential relief as may be necessary to address the matters raised in this submission).	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S104.02.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Oppose primary submission	Kārewarewa urupā has been used for the interment of both members of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa ki te tonga, Ngāti Toarangatira, and the Pākehā settler community. Members of Ātiawa have been on record since 1896 consistently testifying that it is an urupā and a wāhi tapu. Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai would be horrified if housing development was allowed to continue at the urupā/cemetery. The history of Kārewarewa urupā is a dark reflection of previous councils and governments failure to protect the interests of Māori, and the wider community. The opportunity provided through this District Plan process is for Council to go some way to setting this legacy right, and demonstrate a more enlightened and faithful approach to how it informs land use on the Kāpiti Coast. While Kārewarewa Urupā is already a wāhi tapu, for policy purposes it is proposed to recognise this through listing it in Schedule 9- Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori of the District Plan. This means it will be appropriately recognised as a new qualifying matter (under s771 and s770 of the RMA). Retain Kārewarewa urupā as Wāhanga tahi and Wāhanga rua through amendments to Schedule 9 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori the "Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure and Districtwide" map series. The boundary of WTSx1 – Kārewarewa Urupā (Wāhanga Tahi) is extended to include Lot 4 as per the Ngarara West A14B1 block surveyed boundary shown in Figure 3 of our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S104.02.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Oppose primary submission	We oppose this submission it is inappropriate for development to occur on this land as it is a wāhi tapu and will need to be recognised in the Plan in Schedule 9 and the District Plan maps. These changes in the District Plan are a work in progress and the site will be included in the Schedule for Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori which will make the site a qualifying matter under the IPI legislation, this means that it is inappropriate such amendment to be considered.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S104.02.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose primary submission	NHoO support the TAA position and submission regarding Kārewarewa Urupā	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S105	S105.01	Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S105.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree the most residents would consider allowing higher development along the Kāpiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. We agree that Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting that in our iwi perspective the coastline should all be consider 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We support the reference that it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S105	S105.02	Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S105.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S105	S105.03	Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S105.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S105	S105.04	Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S225.FS.2	S105.FS01	Tate, Karen	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission opposing development of Waikanae Old Beach, for the reasons listed above.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S106	S106.01	Munro Duignan Trust	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	<p>The submission supports the submission of the Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc (S105), which sets out reasons for the relief sought in this submission (S106).</p> <p>The submission analyses the reasoning contained in the S32 report for including a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct related to coastal erosion, and states that this reasoning should apply to the coastal hazard of inundation as well.</p> <p>Existing district plan flood hazard provisions do not make the MDRS compatible with the requirements of policy 25 of the NZCPS, as they fail to avoid increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from inundation. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requiring buildings to be above the AEP 1% level only ensures some assets are out of harms way.</li> <li>- There are economic losses associated with properties and residents being cut off due to inundation that would increase through intensification.</li> <li>- Intensification would increase the amount and value of public and private utility infrastructure and other public assets exposed to loss.</li> <li>- Intensification results in increases in impermeable site coverage which would materially increase the volume of water that would not naturally be absorbed.</li> <li>- Cumulative effects cannot be satisfactorily managed by the current flood hazard provisions.</li> </ul> <p>Allowing intensification prior to the implementation of a flood risk/stormwater management plan change violates policy 3 of the NZCPS, which requires a precautionary approach.</p> <p>The submission also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advice from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development and the Ministry for the Environment to the Environment Select Committee on the ability to exclude smaller settlements from the application of the MDRS;</li> <li>- A letter from the Minister for the Environment;</li> <li>- A response from the Ministry for the Environment to a request for information on advice to Ministers relating to obligations in the draft National Adaptation Plan and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement versus the requirement to implement the MDRS.</li> </ul> <p>The submission supports the submission of Glen Wiggs (S098).</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or</li> <li>the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps (<a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a>).</li> </ol> <p>Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.</p>	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S106.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that allowing intensification prior to the implementation of a flood risk/stormwater management plan change compromises policy 3 of the NZCPS, which requires a precautionary approach.</p> <p>The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S106	S106.02	Munro Duignan Trust	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S106.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S106	S106.03	Munro Duignan Trust	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S106.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S106	S106.04	Munro Duignan Trust	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S106.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S107	S107.01	Land Matters Limited	Existing Hazard Qualifying Matters	Not specified	As drafted, compliant residential units can be established on land in identified hazard areas (including flood and liquefaction hazard areas) as a permitted activity. Land owners who establish additional units are likely to expect to be able to subdivide around those units but will trigger at least a restricted discretionary activity rule for subdivision in identified hazard areas. This approach does not manage the potential hazard risk as dwellings will already be established. Greater clarity is required in the process including through the policies to ensure landowners understand the implications of the existing qualifying matters embodied in the subdivision rules for land in identified hazard areas.	<b>Amend</b> to provide for further clarity in the process relating to existing Hazard Qualifying Matters in the subdivision rules and policies.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	<p>The operative District Plan provisions related to hazard overlays (specifically the land use rules related to flood hazards and earthquake hazards outlined in the NH - Natural Hazards chapter, and subdivision rules for the same hazards outlined in the SUB-DW - District Wide Subdivision Matters chapter) operate in the ordinary way under PC2. While the construction and use of 3 residential units is a permitted activity under the MDRS land use rule (GRZ-Rx1), where there is a natural hazard overlay located on the land, then the rules related to the overlay will apply in addition to the MDRS land use rule. The effect this has on activity status will vary depending on the particular overlay that applies to the site. For example, within a flood hazard (ponding area) both rules GRZ-Rx1 and NH-FLOOD-R3 apply, meaning that the construction of 3 residential units is a permitted activity under rule GRZ-Rx1, subject to building floor levels being constructed above the 1% AEP flood level. As another example, within a flood hazard (overflow path) area, new buildings are a non-complying activity under rule NH-FLOOD-R16. This rule overrides GRZ-Rx1, and as a result, the construction of residential units would not be a permitted activity in the overflow path overlay.</p> <p>I consider there to be general alignment between the land use and subdivision rules for natural hazard overlays such that the hazards are able to be managed consistently across the land use and subdivision rules. In relation to the matter of liquefaction, I note that while there is a subdivision rule for this matter (SUB-DW-R9) there is no land use rule (land use rules for liquefaction were removed from the District Plan under Plan Change 1B on the basis that this matter is regulated under the Building Act 2004 and the New Zealand Building Code). I do not consider this to be problematic however, on the basis that liquefaction hazard in relation to the construction of new residential units is regulated under the New Zealand Building Code. This is discussed in further detail in the body of the report.</p> <p>I consider the overall approach to existing natural hazard overlays in the District Plan to be an ordinary approach to the operation of overlays under the National Planning Standards, and I do not consider that any further clarification is required on this within the District Plan.</p>	Do not accept.	No.
S202.FS.1	S107.01.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	Existing Hazard Qualifying Matters	Support primary submission	<p>Support the submitters reasons regarding hazard areas and the relationship with land use and subdivision could be strengthened and clarified.</p> <p>Improves plan applicability and provides greater certainty for subdividers.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S206.FS.7	S107.01.FS02	Landlink	Existing Hazard Qualifying Matters	Support primary submission	As per Landlink's primary submission - believe that further clarification is required around flood risk and MDRH. Agree that it is not feasible to manage flood risk retrospectively through the application of subdivision rules when land use, and therefore effects, have been legally established.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S107	S107.02	Land Matters Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	Residential units/buildings could be constructed as a permitted activity and lawfully established (on land that contains an existing residential unit or is vacant) via the building consenting process. Requiring an approved land use consent where a building consent lawfully establishes a permitted building on a site as a non-complying activity under Rule SUB-RES-R32 results in a perverse outcome.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-Rx1 standards as follows: <b>Standards</b> 1. Where the parent allotment contains an existing residential unit: a. the subdivision must not increase the degree of any non-compliance with Rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 or GRZ-Rx3; or b. the subdivision must comply with an approved land use resource consent or building consent. 2. Where the parent allotment does not contain an existing residential unit: a. it must be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct residential units on the parent allotment that comply with Rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 or GRZ-Rx3; or b. the subdivision must comply with an approved land use resource consent or building consent. ...	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider it inappropriate to provide for building consents as a method of compliance with these standards. Building consents are granted under the Building Act and not the Resource Management Act. Section 37 of the Building Act gives the Council the power to issue a certificate to require resource consent to be obtained prior to building work proceeding, and as a practical matter this results in 'planning checks' being undertaken as part of the processing of a building consent application to assess whether a resource consent may be required for the work. However, such a certificate is separate to a building consent, and in any case a building consent itself does not certify that the building work approved by the building consent complies with or meets the objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan. Rather, it only confirms that the building work meets the provisions of the New Zealand Building Code.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S107.02.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support primary submission	Agree with the submitter's point as it aligns with the intent of primary submission. Improves plan useability and the relief sought would avoid perverse outcomes.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.7	S107.02.FS02	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx2	Support primary submission	Support a change to include that approved building consents could be used to demonstrate compliance with the rule. As per Landlink's primary submission, an application does not receive 'approved' land use for a permitted activity, therefore rule requires amendment/clarification.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S107	S107.03	Land Matters Limited	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	See submission point S107.02.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-R27 standards as follows: <b>Standards</b> 1. Where the parent allotment contains an existing residential unit: a. the subdivision must not increase the degree of any non-compliance with Rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 or GRZ-Rx3; or b. the subdivision must comply with an approved land use resource consent or building consent.  This standard does not apply to the subdivision of land in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. 2. Where the parent allotment does not contain an existing residential unit: a. it must be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct residential units on the parent allotment that comply with Rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 or GRZ-Rx3; or b. the subdivision must comply with an approved land use resource consent or building consent.  This standard does not apply to the subdivision of land in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. ...	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.  Note that as part of the amendments recommended to the rule cascade (outlined in the body of the report), I have recommended deleting standards 1 and 2 from this rule.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S202.FS.1	S107.03.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-R27	Support primary submission	Agree with the submitter's point as it aligns with the intent of primary submission. Improves plan useability and the relief sought would avoid perverse outcomes.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S107	S107.04	Land Matters Limited	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	To provide consistency across the development and subdivision provisions. If construction of a dwelling or building which does not comply with one or more of the standards under rules GRZ-Rx1 or GRZ-Rx2 except for standard GRZ-Rx1.1 can be processed without public notification, then the same should apply to subdivisions where a land use consent exists or where compliance can be demonstrated with those same rules.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-R27 where the development does not comply with one or more of the standards under rules GRZ-Rx1 or GRZ-Rx2, except for standard GRZ-Rx1.1 to provide for an application for a resource consent under this rule to exclude public notification.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S202.FS.1	S107.04.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-R27	Support primary submission	Agree with submitter's reasoning regarding notification. Improves plan useability and the relief sought would avoid perverse outcomes and time delays.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.7	S107.04.FS02	Landlink	SUB-RES-R28	Support primary submission	Support that a non-notified approach should also be supported where land-use consent exists (which was non-notified) and the subdivision is subsequent to that/compliant with controlled activity standards.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S107	S107.05	Land Matters Limited	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	To provide consistency across the development and subdivision provisions. If construction of a dwelling or building which complies with all the standards under rules GRZ-Rx1 or GRZ-Rx2 can be process on a non-notified basis without notifying any party; then the same should apply to subdivisions where a land use consent exists or where compliance can be demonstrated with those same rules.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-R27 where the development does comply with all the standards under rules GRZ-Rx1 or GRZ-Rx2, except for standard GRZ-Rx1.1 to provide an application for resource consent under this rule to exclude public and limited notification.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S107	S107.06	Land Matters Limited	General	Not specified	The District Plan nor the National Planning Standards include an interpretation for the term "dwelling". In particular, given that outlook spaces could be located in different residential units within a building, consistent terminology is required to avoid confusion of what a dwelling constitutes as, where residential unit and residential building are already defined.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx1.8.h (and other subsequent zoning provisions with similar requirements outlook spaces) to remove the term "dwelling" and replace with either "residential building" or "residential unit".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I acknowledge the matter raised by the submitter, I note that the wording used under standard 8 of GRZ-Rx1 is the same as that provided under clause 16 of Schedule 3A to the RMA, which is required to be incorporated into the District Plan.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S107.06.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	General	Support primary submission	Agree with the submitter's point as it aligns with the intent of primary submission. Improves plan useability and is good practice to use consistent terms/definitions.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S107	S107.07	Land Matters Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	No specific reasons given.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-Rx1 in the residential zone to remove the requirement that the maximum number of allotments gaining legal and physical access by rights of way shall be 6.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to my assessment under submission point S107.07.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202.FS.1	S107.07.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support primary submission	Agree with the submitter's point regarding cohousing. Support strengthening provisions regarding co-housing.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.7	S107.07.FS02	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx2	Support primary submission	Support the removal of requirements to limit users of a ROW to 6 when established land use effects could already exceed expectations of use. See further rationale in Landlink primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S107	S107.08	Land Matters Limited	Subdivision rules and matters of discretion	Not specified	Land Matters seeks that the District Plan subdivision rules and matters of discretion are consistent with the LDMR document in relation to the limiting of the number of users off a right of way and specifying the formed and easement widths of right of ways.	Amend the subdivision rules and 'matters of discretion' of those rules, so that they are consistent with Section D - Transportation, and Schedule 3 'Altered requirements to Section 3 NZS 4404:2010 Roads' of the Land Development Minimum Requirements, April 2022, in relation to the limiting of the number of users off a right of way and specifying the formed and easement widths of right of ways.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I am not aware of any inconsistencies between the subdivision rules and matters of control or discretion, and the Council's <i>Land Development Minimum Requirements</i> on these matters.  While I note that Schedule 3(32)(vi) of the LDMR requires that "any developments over 10 dwellings must have the vehicle access designed as an intersection, and not a driveway, unless otherwise approved by Council", this is not inconsistent with standard 7 under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 (which specifies that no more than 6 allotments can gain vehicle access off a right of way). Standard 7 under SUB-RES-Rx1 provides for the consideration of the effects associated with 7 or more allotments being accessed off a single right of way (as a discretionary activity under SUB-RES-R30), whereas Schedule 3(32)(vi) of the LDMR specifies the circumstances where an intersection must be provided instead of a driveway as an engineering matter. I consider these to be separate (and not inconsistent) matters.	Do not accept.	No.
S107	S107.09	Land Matters Limited	General - Housing variety and choice	Not specified	Recognition of policies that recognise diverse and new co-housing arrangements. It would be beneficial to see robust Objectives and Policies that particularly support co-housing as a principle which is not strictly limited to supported living or older persons accommodation.	Amend District Objectives chapter, Urban Form and Development Chapter and General Residential Zone to support co-housing.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that co-housing is already recognised by a range of objectives, policies and rules in the operative District Plan and as proposed by PC2, including (but not limited to): - District objective DO-Ox2, Urban Form and Development policy UFD-P1, and General Residential Zone policy GRZ-Px1, which seek that a variety of housing types are achieved; - General Residential Zone policy GRZ-P17, which provides for shared and group accommodation (which I consider would include co-housing); - General Residential Zone rule GRZ-R4, which provides for shared and group accommodation as a permitted activity subject to standards.  On this basis, I consider that co-housing is already supported by the operative District Plan and PC2.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider that co-housing is already supported by the operative District Plan and PC(N).	No.
S244.FS.1	S107.FS01	McDonald, Deidre	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support full submission. - Flood hazard and liquefaction hazard for landowners - these matters are fundamental and material to subdivision rules and should be made express. - Concern that KDCDC is accepting access roads and right of ways to serve more than six allotments of land, instead of legally vesting new roads and the associated infrastructure. There needs to be an overall and transparent plan for the Kapiti Coast before committing to intensification. This is already being experienced in a piecemeal manner, as can be seen with the case of the Rangiu Road developments. With that in mind, there is a lack of open spaces in Otaki, and this need should be pre-empted through good town planning and an overall design that is future proofed for development.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S108	S108.01	Yager, Graeme	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	Amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S108.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that identified in the Jacobs Report. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zones that those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S108	S108.02	Yager, Graeme	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S108.01.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S108	S108.03	Yager, Graeme	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S108.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S108	S108.04	Yager, Graeme	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S109	S109.01	Yager, Elizabeth	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S109.01.FS01	Nga Hapu o Otaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that identified in the Jacobs Report (volume 2). We agree with reference to the Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zones, those areas will likely be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and precautionary approaches to decision making. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S109	S109.02	Yager, Elizabeth	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S109.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S109	S109.03	Yager, Elizabeth	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S109.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S109	S109.04	Yager, Elizabeth	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S110	S110.01	Mitchell, Chris and Smith, Sue	General	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to):  1. Coastal hazards and NZCPS - Large parts of the district that are currently developed will be subject to significant inundation due to sea level rise. - The avoidance directions in NZCPS policy 25 have been ignored by PC2. - Relying on current plan maps showing potential flooding shows that the effect of the NZCPS direction to avoid has not been understood. - More work must be undertaken to identify areas subject to known coastal hazards.  2. Infrastructure - NZCPS policy 25 applies to infrastructure. This extends to ensuring development can be supported within areas subject to a strong potential for inundation by underground infrastructure. - Section 77(j) should apply to areas where there is no realistic prospect of supporting infrastructure to support more intensive development (such as Paekākāriki).	<b>Withdraw</b> PC2 and obtain better information (if necessary seeking an extension by the minister to allow this).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Under section 80G(1)(c) of the RMA, PC2 cannot be withdrawn.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S110	S110.02	Mitchell, Chris and Smith, Sue	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S110.01.	<b>Remove</b> all areas subject to potential inundation from coastal hazards from the PC 2 provisions. These are the areas identified in the Jacobs vol2 report (2022) (commissioned by the Council) as subject to inundation within the median 100 year sea level rise.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Refer to Matters D and E outlined in section 4.12.2 of the body of the report for assessment relevant to this matter.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that in response to other submissions I have recommended extending the spatial extent of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct at Peka Peka.	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S111	S111.01	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, The Department of Corrections	Definitions	Oppose	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 well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA.  Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is therefore important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	<b>Add</b> definition of "Community Corrections Activity" as follows:  <u>Community Corrections Activity:</u>  <u>means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.</u>	4.6.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Community Corrections Activities	Based on my recommendations on S111.05 and S111.06, I do not consider that this definition is required.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S111.01.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definitions	Support primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, particularly as it relates to enabling and providing a consent pathway for community corrections activities within the urban environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.6.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Community Corrections Activities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S111	S111.02	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, The Department of Corrections	Definitions	Oppose	The National Planning Standards includes definitions for "residential activity" and "residential unit" that must be used when a local authority includes a definition for such in its plan. The Operative District Plan includes both of these definitions.  However, the definition of "residential unit" refers to a "household" which is currently defined in the Operative Plan, but in a way that does not provide sufficient clarity that a household is not necessarily limited to a family unit or a flatting arrangement (which are more commonly perceived household situations).	<b>Replace</b> the existing definition of "Household" with the following:  <u>Household:</u>  <u>means a person or group of people who live together as a unit whether or not:</u> <u>a. any or all of them are members of the same family; or</u> <u>b. one or more members of the group (whether or not they are paid) provides day-to-day care, support and supervision to any other member(s) of the group.</u>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The definition of <i>household</i> in the operative District plan is "every residential unit whether of one or more persons". I consider this definition to be broad, and I do not consider that it limits the consideration of households to any particular type of household (such as a family unit or a flatting arrangement). I therefore consider the requested amendment to be unnecessary.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S111.02.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definitions	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, where it seeks to recognise the differing types of households within the urban environment, however Kāinga Ora consider that the existing definition provides for this as well as other forms of households as currently drafted.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S111	S111.03	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, The Department of Corrections	DO-Ox2	Support in part	Ara Poutama requests this provision be 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 community; and housing for those on bail or community-based sentences.  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.	<b>Amend</b> Objective DO-Ox2 as follows:  <u>DO-Ox2 – Housing in Relevant Residential Zones</u>  <u>Relevant residential zones provide for a variety of housing types, households, and sizes that respond to:</u> <u>1. housing needs and demands; and</u> <u>2. the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.</u>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S111.03.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox2	Support primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, particularly as it recognises the differing types of households within the urban environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S111	S111.04	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, The Department of Corrections	GRZ-Px1	Support in part	Ara Poutama requests policy GRZ-Px1 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 community; and housing for those on bail or community-based sentences.  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.	<b>Amend</b> policy GRZ-Px1 as follows:  <u>GRZ-Px1</u>  <u>Enable a variety of housing typologies and households with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments.</u>	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S111.04.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ-Px1	Support primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, particularly as it recognises the differing types of households within the urban environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S111	S111.05	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, The Department of Corrections	MCZ, TCZ, MUZ - Policies and rules	Oppose	Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the objectives, policies, and rules for the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, and Mixed Use Zone to enable "Community Corrections Activity" as a permitted activity.  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 well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA.  Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities, specifically the higher population the perceptible of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	<b>1. Amend</b> the following policies to enable Community Corrections Activities:  • Metropolitan Centre Zone Policy MCZ-P1, MCZ-P2, and MCZ-P3. • Town Centre Zone Policy TCZ-P1. • Mixed Use Zone Policy MUZ-P1, and MUZ-P2.  <b>2. Amend</b> the rules in the following zones to enable Community Corrections Activity to be undertaken as permitted activities:  • Metropolitan Centre Zone. • Town Centre Zone. • Mixed Use Zone.	4.6.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Community Corrections Activities	Based on the description of community corrections activity (identified in S111.01), I consider that community corrections activities are a <i>community facility</i> under the operative District Plan.  The definition of <i>community facility</i> in the District Plan is the National Planning Standards definition, which "means land and buildings used by members of the community for recreational, sporting, cultural, safety, health, welfare, or worship purposes. It includes provision for any ancillary activity that assists with the operation of the community facility".  This means that under the rules of the Community Facilities chapter (specifically CF-R1 and CF-R2), community corrections activities are already a permitted activity (subject to standards) in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone and General Industrial Zone, as sought by Ara Poutama. I also consider that the location of community facilities in a range of zones (including the Centres and Mixed Use zones) is appropriately supported through objectives and policies in the operative District Plan.  On this basis I consider that community corrections activities are already provided for in the District Plan, and do not consider it necessary to amend PC2 to provide specific rules for them.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that community corrections activities are already a permitted activity as <i>community facilities</i> under rules CF-R1 and CF-R2.	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S111.05.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ, TCZ, MUZ - Policies and rules	Support primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, particularly as it relates to enabling and providing a consent pathway for community corrections activities within the urban environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.6.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Community Corrections Activities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S111	S111.06	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, The Department of Corrections	GIZ-P1, GIZ-P2 and GIZ rules	Oppose	Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the objectives, policies, and rules for the General Industrial Zone to enable "Community Corrections Activity" as a permitted activity. Ara Poutama's existing community corrections site in Kapiti Coast District is located in the General Industrial 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 well-being and for their health and safety to achieve the purpose of the RMA.  Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for these types of facilities. Specifically with the higher population, the proportion of those people needing community corrections services will correspondingly increase. It is therefore important that provision is made to enable non-custodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas.	1. <b>Amend</b> General Industrial Zone Policies GIZ-P1, and GIZ-P2 to enable Community Corrections Activities.  2. <b>Amend</b> the rules of the General Industrial Zone to enable Community Corrections Activity to be undertaken as a permitted activity.	4.6.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Community Corrections Activities	Refer to S111.05.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that community corrections activities are already a permitted activity as <i>community facilities</i> under rules CF-R1 and CF-R2.	<b>No.</b>
S122.FS.1	S111.06.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GIZ-P1, GIZ-P2 and GIZ rules	Support primary submission	Kāinga Ora supports Ara Poutama Aotearoa's submission, particularly as it relates to enabling and providing a consent pathway for community corrections activities within the urban environment.	Allow primary submission.	4.6.3 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Community Corrections Activities	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S112	S112.01	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	DO-O3	Support in part	Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient 'additional infrastructure' (which includes educational facilities) is provided in development, and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular).  Educational facilities should therefore be enabled in the Operative District Plan to service the growth that PCC2 will enable.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O3 as follows: <b>Development Management</b>  To maintain a consolidated urban form within existing urban areas and a limited number of identified growth areas, which and to provide for the <i>development</i> of new urban areas where these can be efficiently serviced and integrated with existing townships, delivering:  1. urban areas which maximise the efficient end use of energy and integration with infrastructure; 2. a variety of living and working areas in a manner which reinforces the function and vitality of centres; 3. an urban environment that enables more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, parts of the urban environment; a. that are in or near a <i>Centre Zone</i> or other area with many employment opportunities; or b. that are well serviced by existing or planned public transport; or c. where there is high demand for housing or for business land relative to other areas within the urban environment; d. where there is sufficient capacity within the existing or planned infrastructure network (including additional infrastructure) to service the growth. ... <b>Add</b> a definition of 'additional infrastructure' to the definitions chapter under the NPS-UD.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I do not consider it appropriate to amend the objective in the manner requested by the submitter, because clause 3 of the DO-O3 is structured to mirror Objective 3 of the NPS-UD (which identifies the parts of the urban environment that the NPS-UD seeks to enable more people to live in).  However, I consider that the matters requested by the submitter are broadly recognised under district objective DO-O13 (Infrastructure), and that this is supported by my recommendations on submission points S112.02 and S112.03.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.13	S112.01.FS01	Landlink	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Support the inclusion of a policy reference which outlines the importance of 'providing for the development of new urban areas'. Also support the acknowledgement/inclusion of having regard to the planned provision of infrastructure. Further note that the education network should be responsive to planned and projected growth (through additional provision or other network management utilisation tools) i.e. infrastructure may not always be existing where homes are currently needed.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S112.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Concerns regarding the lack of social infrastructure and educational facilities.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S112.01.FS03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O3	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought, as the additional wording as sought is not needed as integration with infrastructure is already considered in clause 1. It is also unclear what the definition of 'additional infrastructure' would be.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S112	S112.02	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	UFD-P1	Support in part	The Ministry supports the proposed changes to UFD-P1 to ensure new urban development is integrated with the planned capacity of infrastructure to service growth. Educational facilities are an essential component of social infrastructure that is required to support the needs and demand of growing communities. However, the existing definition of 'infrastructure' used in UFD-P1 does not include social infrastructure.  See also submission point S112.01	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P1 as follows: ... 4. avoids urban expansion that would compromise the distinctiveness of existing settlements and unique character values in the rural environment between and around settlements; 5. can be sustained within and makes efficient use of existing capacity of public services and strategic infrastructure, or is integrated with the planned capacity of public services, and, infrastructure and additional infrastructure; and 6. promotes the efficient use of energy and water.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider the amendments requested by the submitter are generally consistent with Objective 6(a) and clause 3.5 of the NPS-UD. However, I consider that the term "likely availability of additional infrastructure" is more appropriate because this is consistent with the terminology used in clause 3.5 of the NPS-UD, as this recognises that not all additional infrastructure (such as schools) is the responsibility of the Council.  I also recommend the inclusion of a definition for <i>additional infrastructure</i> consistent with the definition contained in the NPS-UD, as requested by the submitter.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting that I recommend using the terminology "likely availability of additional infrastructure".  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for improved recognition of additional infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with Objective 6(a) and clause 3.5 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P1. Refer section 2.2 of PC(R1). Add a definition of ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE. Refer section 20.16 of PC(R1).
S206.FS.13	S112.02.FS01	Landlink	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Support the inclusion of a policy reference which outlines the importance of 'providing for the development of new urban areas'. Also support the acknowledgement/inclusion of having regard to the planned provision of infrastructure. Further note that the education network should be responsive to planned and projected growth (through additional provision or other network management utilisation tools) i.e. infrastructure may not always be existing where homes are currently needed.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S112.02.FS02	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Concerns regarding the lack of social infrastructure and educational facilities.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122.FS.1	S112.02.FS03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought, as the additional wording as sought is not needed as integration with infrastructure is already considered in clause 1.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S112	S112.03	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	UFD-P4	Support in part	See submission points S112.01 and S112.02.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P4 as follows:  The density of subdivision and development will be managed through an area-specific approach to achieve an appropriate range of housing types across the District, as set out below: ... 5. in areas where infrastructure constraints exist (such as water, wastewater or roading), densities will reflect those constraints residential densities will be integrated with existing or planned infrastructure (including additional infrastructure) capacity.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	In response to submission point S207.06, I have recommended simplifying this policy to avoid unnecessary duplication with policy detail provided for elsewhere throughout the District Plan. As a result the I recommend the policy no longer refer to infrastructure, on the basis that this matter is already addressed under policy UFD-P1 (which I have recommended include reference to <i>additional infrastructure</i> ) in response to submission point S112.02.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122.FS.1	S112.03.FS01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P4	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora oppose the relief sought, as the additional wording as sought is not needed as integration with infrastructure is already considered in clause 1.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S113	S113.01	Herrington, Garry	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S113.01.FS01	Nga Hapu o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that identified in the Jacobs Report and the current draft KCDC Plan change. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti project, that Adaptation Zone areas will be future areas affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and a precautionary approach to decision making. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S113	S113.02	Herrington, Garry	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S113.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S114	S114.01	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	Definitions: Noise Sensitive activity	Support in part	The definition of noise sensitive activity excludes residential development in non-residential zones. This is not appropriate, at least in relation to commercial and mixed use zones, where it is important that at least habitable rooms in the same are considered noise sensitive.	<b>Delete</b> exclusion 1 to the definition of Noise Sensitive Activity to ensure that residential activities in Commercial and Mixed Use zones are considered noise sensitive and subject to provisions relating to the same. Otherwise retain the definition as notified.  Noise sensitive activity means: ... For the avoidance of doubt Noise Sensitive Activities do not include: <b>1. residential accommodation in buildings which predominantly have other uses such as commercial or industrial premises;</b> 2. garages and ancillary buildings not containing any habitable room(s); and 3. premises and facilities which are not yet built, other than premises and facilities for which a building consent has been obtained which has not yet lapsed	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The definition does not exclude residential development in non-residential zones from the definition of a <i>noise sensitive activity</i> . Rather it excludes residential accommodation within buildings that are predominantly used for non-residential uses from the definition of a <i>noise sensitive activity</i> .  Buildings that are predominantly residential accommodation in Commercial and Mixed Use zones are considered <i>noise sensitive activities</i> and are subject to the provisions related to <i>noise sensitive activities</i> (specifically rule NOISE-R14 in the Noise chapter of the District Plan). I do not consider there to be sufficient justification to alter this approach as part of incorporating the MDRS or giving effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S114	S114.02	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	DO-O3	Support	While a number of changes are proposed to the objective, it retains the clause requiring management of the location and effects of potentially incompatible land uses, including at the interface of these uses. This is important to sustainable management of existing non-residential activities.	<b>Retain</b> DO-O3 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to DO-O3 in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S114	S114.03	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	DO-O11	Support in part	Reverse sensitivity effects  PC2 increases the potential for reverse sensitivity effects, which may occur both across and within zones. This is not as clearly reflected in clause 5 of DO-O11 as perhaps intended. This appears to be an historic issue with the position of the brackets and should be appropriately corrected through PC2.	<b>Amend</b> clause 5 of DO-O11 as follows but otherwise retain as notified:  <del>To maintain and enhance</del> <b>recognise</b> the unique character and amenity values of the District's distinct communities, while providing for character and amenity values to develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations, so that residents and visitors enjoy:  1. relaxed, unique and distinct village identities and predominantly low-density residential areas characterised by the presence of mature vegetation, a variety of built forms and building densities, the retention of landforms, and the recognition of unique community identities; 2. vibrant, lively metropolitan and town centres supported by higher density residential and mixed use areas; 3. neighbourhood local centres, village communities and employment areas characterised by high levels of amenity, accessibility and convenience; 4. productive rural areas, characterised by openness, natural landforms, areas and corridors of indigenous vegetation, and primary production activities; and 5. well managed interfaces between different types of land use areas (e.g. between living, working and rural areas) and between potentially conflicting land uses, so as to minimise adverse effects.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree that the position of the brackets appears to be an error, as the list contained within the brackets is intended to relate to land use areas, and not specific land uses. I consider the amendment requested by the submitter would improve interpretation of the provision.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend DO-O11 (refer to section 1.11 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for improved interpretation of the objective.
S114	S114.04	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	UFD-P1	Support in part	Reverse sensitivity effects  PC2 has potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established non-residential activities, particularly those operating at the interface with residential zones but also in commercial and mixed use zone with increased residential density.  It is appropriate that policy direction in this regard be provided. This would seem to most appropriately be located in the Urban Form and Development chapter which applies across all zones, rather than at a zone level, although the latter would achieve the same intent.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P1 as follows but otherwise retain as notified:  <b>New urban development for residential activities will only be located within existing urban areas and identified growth areas, and will be undertaken in a manner which:</b>  1. supports the District's consolidated urban form; 2. maintains the integrity of the urban edge north of Waikanae and Ōtaki; 3. manages residential densities by:  <del>a. enabling medium density housing and focused infill housing in identified precinct areas that are close to centres, public open spaces, and public transport nodes;</del> <del>b. retaining a predominantly low residential density in the Residential Zones;</del> <del>c. avoiding any significant adverse effects of subdivision and development in special character areas identified in GRZ-P3;</del>  a. providing for a variety of housing types and densities in the General Residential Zone; b. enabling increased housing densities:  i. in, and within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone; ii. within a walkable catchment of the train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae; and iii. in and adjacent to the Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone;  4. avoids urban expansion that would compromise the distinctiveness of existing settlements and unique character values in the rural environment between and around settlements; 5. can be sustained within and makes efficient use of existing capacity of public services and strategic infrastructure, or is integrated with the planned capacity of public services and infrastructure; and 6. promotes the efficient use of energy and water. <b>7. Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree that it is useful to include general policy guidance within District Plan strategic direction on the need to manage reverse sensitivity effects as a general consideration when considering the location of new urban development for residential activities. I consider that this would be consistent District Objective DO-O15(1)(e).	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P1. Refer section 2.2 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it recognises the need to consider reverse sensitivity effects as a general consideration, in a manner that is consistent with objective DO-O15(1)(e).



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S114	S114.05	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	GRZ-P9	Support in part	Proposed amendments to clause 2 delete the requirement for new built development to relate to local identity, character and density and instead require development to be compatible with the planned built character of the zone. While this may be a consideration in terms of the permitted baseline, the policy should also recognise the existing lawfully established environment.	<b>Amend</b> clause 2 of GRZ-P9 as follows but otherwise retain it as notified:  <i>Residential activities</i> will be recognised and provided for as the principal use in the <i>Residential Zones</i> , while ensuring that the <i>effects of subdivision</i> , use and <i>development</i> is in accordance with the following principles:  1. adverse <i>effects</i> on natural systems will be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 2. new built <i>development</i> will relate to local built identity, character values and the density of the surrounding residential environment be compatible with the planned built character of the Zone and minimise reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities; 3. transport choice and efficiency will be maximised; 4. housing types which meet the need of households will be provided for; 5. the number of <i>residential units per allotment</i> will be limited; and 6. a limited number of <i>accessory buildings and buildings</i> which are <i>ancillary to residential activities</i> will be provided for.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that policy guidance on reverse sensitivity effects in the General Residential Zone is already provided for through policy GRZ-P8.	Do not accept.	No.
S114	S114.06	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	GRZ-P10	Support in part	See submission point S114.05.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-P10 as follows:  <i>Subdivision</i> , use and <i>development</i> in the <i>Residential Zones</i> will be required to achieve a high level of on-site amenity for residents and neighbours in accordance with the following principles:  1. <i>building size and footprint</i> will be proportional to the size of the <i>allotment</i> ; 2. usable and easily accessible private <i>outdoor living spaces</i> will be provided; 3. <i>buildings and structures</i> will be designed and located to maximise sunlight access, privacy and amenity for the <i>site</i> and adjoining <i>allotments</i> ; 4. <i>buildings and structures</i> will be designed and located to minimise visual impact and to ensure they are of a scale which is consistent with the area's urban form compatible with the planned built character of the Zone and minimise reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities; 5. appropriate separation distances will be maintained between <i>buildings</i> ; 6. <i>yards</i> will be provided to achieve appropriate <i>building</i> setbacks from neighbouring areas, the street and the coast; 7. hard and impermeable surfaces will be offset by permeable areas on individual <i>allotments</i> ; 8. unreasonable and excessive <i>noise</i> , odour, smoke, <i>dust</i> , light, glare and vibration will be avoided; 9. <i>non-residential buildings</i> will be of a form and scale which is compatible with the surrounding residential environment; and 10. service areas for <i>non-residential activities</i> will be screened, and planting and <i>landscaping</i> will be provided.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that policy guidance on reverse sensitivity effects in the General Residential Zone is already provided for through policy GRZ-P8.	Do not accept.	No.
S094.FS.1	S114.06.FS01	KiwiRail	GRZ-P10	Support primary submission	KiwiRail considers that consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities (including transport infrastructure) is important and should be recognised in this policy.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S114	S114.07	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	NOISE-R14	Oppose	Recognise that intensification has potential to generate adverse effects on lawfully established existing non-residential activities and that these need to be minimised. This potential is most apparent with regard to development of noise sensitive activities not captured by Noise R14 in the operative plan, particularly Mixed Use zones, zone interfaces, and adjoining existing non-residential activities in residential zones.	<b>Amend</b> NOISE-R14 to ensure that new noise sensitive activities that require resource consent and have potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities in residential, commercial, and mixed use zones, including at their interface with other zones, must comply with the requirements of clauses 1 and 4 of NOISE-R14 to minimise reverse sensitivity effects. Make consequential amendments to ensure this is reflected in related provisions.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought by the submitter, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.  I note that all noise sensitive activities are subject to compliance with standards 1 to 4 under rule NOISE-R14. I consider that noise sensitive activities that breach NOISE-R14 would be a discretionary, in which case reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities could be taken into consideration as part of a resource consent application.  In relation to residential development in the General Residential Zone, I also note that rule GRZ-Rx6, which is the restricted discretionary activity rule for development with 4 or more residential units, includes reverse sensitivity effects as a matter of discretion.	Do not accept.	No.
S094.FS.1	S114.07.FS01	KiwiRail	NOISE-R14	Support primary submission	KiwiRail considers that consideration of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing non-residential activities (including transport infrastructure) is important and should be recognised.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S115	S115.01	Templeton Kapiti Limited	Design Guides	Support in part	TKL supports the inclusion of design guidance for the General Residential Zone and the Centre Zones, however TKL seeks amendments to the Residential and Centres Design Guides.  This statement is vague. Point #2 covers similar matters in a more directive manner and therefore #1 does not provide any additional guidance beyond this.	<b>Delete</b> #1 of the Residential Design Guide: <del>Buildings should be orientated with the front of the dwelling(e)-facing the street or public space.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Support for the inclusion of design guidance is noted.  I agree that the matters provided for under guideline 1 are provided for under guideline 2.	Accept.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend guideline 1 of the Residential Design Guide. Refer Appendix B of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better achieves the intent of the guideline and provides for a more efficient application of the Centres Design Guide.
S115	S115.02	Templeton Kapiti Limited	Design Guides	Support in part	The wording of this statement is ambiguous as to whether only tall solid vegetation is to be avoided, or all vegetation. As vegetation by its nature is unlikely to be solid, and creates desirable privacy without adverse effects, vegetation should generally be encouraged in residential areas.	<b>Amend</b> #4 of the Residential Design Guide: <del>Avoid tall solid fencing or vegetation between outdoor living spaces and the street or other public spaces.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I consider that the guideline may be difficult to apply in relation to vegetation. I also consider that other guidelines (particularly guideline 62) seek to encourage vegetation along certain thresholds where guideline 4 may also apply. I therefore consider it appropriate to remove the reference to vegetation under guideline 4.	Accept.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend guideline 4 of the Residential Design Guide. Refer Appendix B of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better achieves the intent of the guideline and provides for a more efficient application of the Centres Design Guide.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S115	S115.03	Templeton Kapiti Limited	Design Guides	Support in part	These statements are generic and do not provide for diversity in site design. The ability to utilise a range of the front, side and back of buildings for off street parking provides more opportunities to provide for variety in the streetscape. Flexibility (subject to specific location and design of each site) to use all three options should be enabled. It is further noted in relation to residential development, that #19 of the Residential Design Guide (which seeks to ensure that carparking does not dominant the streetscape) appropriately addresses this point.	<del>Delete #11 of the Residential Design Guide and #15 of the Centres Design Guide: <u>Locating off street parking between buildings and the street is discouraged.</u></del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The intent of this guideline is to discourage the development of at-grade parking areas between buildings and the street. While I consider that guideline 19 provides guidance with respect to garages and car ports, it does not cover at-grade parking areas. I therefore consider it appropriate to retain guideline 11, but amend it so that it applies only to at-grade parking.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend guideline 11 to apply only to at grade parking areas.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend guideline 11 of the Residential Design Guide. Refer Appendix B of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better achieves the intent of the guideline and provides for a more efficient application of the Centres Design Guide.
S115	S115.04	Templeton Kapiti Limited	Design Guides	Support in part	These statements are unnecessarily restrictive and would prevent site-specific responses. It is further noted in relation to residential development, that the first part of the statement is addressed by #10 (which seeks to minimise the number of additional vehicle crossings provided for any new development) while the second part of the statement is addressed by #17 (which encourages internal streets and rear lanes to contribute to the amenity and attractiveness of the site).	<del>Delete #15 of the Residential Design Guide and #19 of the Centres Design Guide: <u>Multi-unit developments on large or deep sites should be accessed from new streets and lanes with multiple access points rather than long driveways with a single access point. The frontage of dwellings along internal streets should be treated in a similar fashion to frontage onto a public street.</u></del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The intent of this guideline is to encourage the new streets and lanes to be provided with multiple access points, rather than a single access point (in other words, a cul-de-sac). I consider that this aspect of the guideline is not addressed under guideline 10 or any other guideline.  However, I agree that the matters covered in the second part of this guideline are otherwise addressed by guideline 17.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend guideline 15 of the Residential Design Guide and guideline 19 of the Centres Design Guide to delete the second sentence of the guideline.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend guideline 15 of the Residential Design Guide. Refer Appendix B of PC(R1). Amend guideline 19 of the Centres Design Guide. Refer Appendix C of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better achieves the intent of the guideline and provides for a more efficient application of the Centres Design Guide.
S115	S115.05	Templeton Kapiti Limited	Design Guides	Support in part	The landscape character of public spaces does not need to relate to the surrounding buildings, as this places unnecessary value on the aesthetics of buildings, but instead can have their own distinct design driver and style unrelated to adjacent buildings.	<del>Amend #33 of the Centres Design Guide: <u>"When designing outdoor public space, use design elements (e.g. shapes, patterns, structures) that are compatible with the design of adjacent buildings to create spaces that are unique and respond to their local context."</u></del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The intent of the guideline is to "create spaces that are unique and respond to their local context". I consider that the amendment requested by the submitter provides a greater degree of flexibility for applicants to demonstrate how this outcome is achieved.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend guideline 33 of the Centres Design Guide. Refer Appendix C of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better achieves the intent of the guideline and provides for a more efficient application of the Centres Design Guide.
S115	S115.06	Templeton Kapiti Limited	Design Guides	Support in part	The statement as currently worded reads as a requirement for all ground floor dwellings in the centre zones, which would prevent site-specific responses and make accessible building design harder to achieve.	<del>Amend #105 of the Centres Design Guide: <u>"Where dwellings are located close to the street, it is encouraged to elevate the ground floor of the dwelling slightly above the street level to provide outlook into the street while maintaining privacy for residents."</u></del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I agree that this guideline reads as a requirement, and that the amended wording requested by the submitter better provides for the guideline to be read as a guideline. However, I consider it would be more efficient to state "consider elevating" rather than "it is encouraged to elevate".  However, I also consider this guideline to be a duplication of guideline 100, so I consider that it would be appropriate to delete guideline 105, and make the amendment requested by the submitter under guideline 100.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting alternative wording recommended.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend guidelines 100 and 105 of the Centres Design Guide. Refer Appendix C of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better achieves the intent of the guideline and provides for a more efficient application of the Centres Design Guide.
S115	S115.07	Templeton Kapiti Limited	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	The reason for this deletion is that the imposition of conditions under sections 108 and 220 is enabled by the Resource Management Act and therefore including this as a specific matter of control is unnecessary. TKL recommends that the ODP is reviewed for any additional instances of this matter occurring in rules and that these are also deleted as superfluous (noting that this appears in SUB-DW-R6; SUB-RES-R25; SUB-RES-R26; SUB-OS-R58; SUB-DEV1- R62; and GRZ-R11 as well).	<del>Amend "SUB-RES-Rx1" as follows: Matters of Control ... <u>9. The imposition of conditions in accordance with sections 108 and 220 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</u></del>	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I agree that this matter of control is unnecessary as it simply restates the powers available to Council under sections 108 and 220 of the RMA. I note that the District Plan subdivision rules generally only apply this matter of control to controlled activity rules, however I note that section 87(2)(b) also confirms the Council's power to impose conditions on resource consents for controlled activities.  I recommend removing this matter of control from the rule, and all other controlled activity rules where this occurs in provisions notified under PC2.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-R11, SUB-RES-R25, SUB-RES-R26, SUB-RES-Rx1, SUB-WORK-R36, SUB-WORK-R37, SUB-WORK-R39. Refer to sections 4.26, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.14, 10.15, and 10.16 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more efficient interpretation of the District Plan matters of control by avoiding unnecessary duplication of a power provided for under sections 87, 108 and 220 of the RMA.
S115	S115.08	Templeton Kapiti Limited	FC-Table x2 - Financial Contribution payable	Not specified	The reason for the additions is to ensure that the cost of any connection or capacity upgrading of a Council network is limited to that required to meet the demand generated by the specific proposal and ensure that those developing land are not required to bear the cost of any unrelated works.	<del>Amend "FC-Table x2 – Financial Contribution payable" as follows: Reasons for financial contribution <u>Water supply systems:</u> • Where an existing supply is available, but the capacity of the system is inadequate to meet the additional generated demand, the cost of connection and capacity upgrading of the existing system to meet the additional generated demand;  <u>Stormwater disposal services:</u> • Where an existing outfall is available, but the capacity of the system is inadequate to meet the additional generated demand, the cost of connecting and capacity upgrading of the stormwater system to meet the additional generated demand;  <u>Wastewater disposal services:</u> • Where an existing wastewater network and treatment plant are available, but their capacity is inadequate to meet the additional generated demand, the cost of connection and capacity upgrading to meet the additional generated demand;</del>	4.17 Financial Contributions	I consider that the amendments requested by the submitter are reasonable as they improve the interpretation of the provision.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend FC-Table x2 (refer section 15.3 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider these amendments to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because they provides for a clearer, more efficient and effective interpretation of the standard.
S206.FS.14	S115.08.FS01	Landlink	FC-Table x2 - Financial Contribution payable	Support primary submission	Support the notion that the cost of any connection or capacity upgrading of the KCDC network is limited to that required to meet the demand generated by the specific proposal. This is a reasonable expectation and provisions beyond this may not be conducive to the implementation of the NPS-UD as people are deterred from undertaking development.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.17 Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S115	S115.09	Templeton Kapiti Limited	General	Not specified	No specific reasons given.	TKL seeks any other <b>amendments</b> as are appropriate to address any inconsistencies, resolve ambiguities, achieve better urban design outcomes and / or facilitate the provision of additional housing.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought by the submitter, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.	Do not accept.	No.
S116	S116.01	Petherick, Laurence	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose	The submitter has owned or occupied property in Waikanae Beach for over 70 years, and has not witnessed any formal use or maintenance of the area as a burial ground. Apart from two relocated tombstones and reinterred remains, only minor evidence of buried remains have been found.  The undeveloped area is an overgrown eyesore of undesirable weeds, a dumping ground for rubbish, and a home to rats and stoats. The submitter is concerned about who would be responsible for maintenance of the area. The submission also notes that there may be a loss of rates associated with classification as an urupā.  There is demand for a new school in Waikanae Beach, and the undeveloped area would be ideally located for a new school.	<b>Retain</b> the General Residential zone in the developed portion of the area described as Kārewarewa Urupā, with the undeveloped area to remain as either General Residential or Proposed School. [It is implied that the decision requested is to <b>reject</b> the proposed addition of Kārewarewa Urupā to Schedule 9 and the District Plan maps.]	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	I consider that there is sufficient evidence (as documented in the Section 32 Evaluation Report) to justify recognising and providing for Kārewarewa Urupā as a qualifying matter. On this basis, I do not consider it appropriate to reject the proposed addition of Kārewarewa Urupā to Schedule 9 of the District Plan.	Do not accept.	No.
S104.FS.1	S116.01.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Support primary submission	WLC supports the submission points to the extent that they oppose the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Allow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S116.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	Kārewarewa urupā has been used for the interment of both members of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa ki te tonga, Ngāti Toarangatira, and the Pākehā settler community. Members of Ātiawa have been on record since 1896 consistently testifying that it is an urupā and a wāhi tapu. Including Kārewarewa urupā as a wāhi tapu in the District Plan provides for: • The development of a management plan for Wāhanga Rua to provide further support and assistance to existing residents as to how to manage the impacts of a wāhi tapu designation on their properties, in order to minimise the ongoing effects to those land owners, iwi and those who have been interred. • The protection of Wāhanga Tahī from further desecration, the prevention of further exposure of human remains and a mechanism to prevent the further effects to the community and future residents who may otherwise unknowingly find themselves living on a cemetery. The development of a school on the site is strongly opposed and a fundamentally inappropriate use of a wāhi tapu, including Kārewarewa urupā. Retain Kārewarewa urupā as Wāhanga tahī and Wāhanga rua through amendments to Schedule 9 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori the "Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure and Districtwide" map series. The boundary of WTSx1 – Kārewarewa Urupā (Wāhanga Tahī) is extended to include Lot 4 as per the Ngarara West A14B1 block surveyed boundary shown in Figure 3 of our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S116.01.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	Kārewarewa Urupā should be included in Schedule 9 and the District Plan maps as a wāhi tapu to protect the site and surrounding area from further effects. As mentioned above, this site is in the process of being placed in the SASM schedule of the Operative Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S116.01.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Schedule 9, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	NHoO support the TAA position and submission regarding Kārewarewa Urupā	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S117	S117.01	Carter, Brian	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the blanket change to 3 storey housing in general residential areas, for the following reasons: - privacy; - loss of daylight; - general amenity loss to affected properties; - fences, hedges and privacy screens are ineffective to counter the intrusion of a 3 storey neighbouring building; - the inability to oppose 3 storey development where neighbours would incur 'more than minor' effect is unfair; - the devaluation of 'amenity' of affected neighbours has no provision for compensation, badly affected parties suffer a loss beyond their control; - 3 storey housing should be subject to agreement of affected neighbours; - instances of severe negative impact on neighbours would be common if the proposed PC2 proceeds in its current form; - residential areas are intrinsically character areas and part of existing communities, degrading these should not happen where alternative solutions to the 'housing problem' are available; - housing intensification should be available close to transport hubs and where existing or (efficient) new infrastructure can cope, which does not apply to the proposed changes; - the cost to install infrastructure (primarily drainage) is likely to be significant, a burden which has historically fallen on existing ratepayers; - other factors which need careful consideration, including geotechnical (presence of peat and soft sands), sea level rise (affecting drainage systems), and extreme events; - expansion needs careful consideration, rather than the amateur decisions of politicians flexing to interest groups. Comments above regarding affected neighbours also apply to 4 storey development at Paraparaumu Beach. To preserve the landscape amenity of the beach zone, 4 storey development should not be visible from the coastal strip. This would preclude much of the proposed zone (B PRECx2). The relaxation of height limits in the Paraparaumu Beach commercial zone is also opposed. Landowners would have windfall profits with land values going up. The area is currently a quaint coastal village, and the landscape amenity would be obliterated. The commercial zone is currently semi-disused.	PC2 should be <b>withdrawn</b> and a new document developed based on well thought out and balanced assessment.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Under section 80G(1)(c) of the RMA, PC2 cannot be withdrawn.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S117.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S117.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	General	Support primary submission	NHoO recommends the blanket MDRS changes are not applied in the Otaki area.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S118	S118.01	Eames, Penelope	Waikanae Beach	Oppose	This submitter opposes the intensification of Waikanae Beach for the following reasons: - New residents have left no room for new intensification. The beach area is already fully populated. There are still beach holiday houses, but the majority of houses are now filled with permanent residents. - Waikanae Beach is a special area with rich history and diversity, passion and community support throughout our region. - Most of Waikanae Beach is built on land that was previously, a forest, a swamp, lake, river or a small sand dunes. Flooding is common and yet there has been a limited amount of stormwater research done and limited drainage completed. - Intensification would bring more children to Waikanae Beach. As there is no room in schools in Waikanae and no school at Waikanae Beach this is a barrier to more families coming to the area. - The only community hall in Waikanae needs an earthquake assessment. The consensus (by the Community Board) that our only hall should be bowled down and rebuilt on a larger section. - The intensification proposal notes that access to transport or transport hubs should be considered. We have a few buses coming down to Waikanae Beach, usually having just meet a regular trains at Waikanae Station to take the bus route.	<b>Acknowledge</b> the Special Character of Waikanae Beach and remember their acceptance of the Waikanae Futures Plan and the rulings from the Environment Court.  <b>Acknowledge</b> that most of Waikanae Beach housing has been built on a flood plain and is still subject to a significant amount of stormwater flooding. This is based on the fact that most of the region was, before building and filling a mix of swamps, rivers and lakes made Waikanae Beach unsuitable for intensification.  <b>Acknowledge</b> that Waikanae Beach residents are capable of making decisions about their own region and have been building our community for 200 years in a positive and productive way.  <b>Acknowledge</b> that Waikanae Beach has experienced a significant increase in its population as a result of the finishing of Transmission Gully and the Expressway.  <b>Acknowledge</b> that Waikanae Beach children need access to Primary and Secondary schools. This being a far more important need than building more houses and the KCDC staff and councillors should lobby the Ministry of Education to achieve this essential goal before trying to find space for intensive housing.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	In relation to special character areas, refer to the assessment of Matters F and G in the body of the report. In relation to flood hazards, refer to the assessment of Matters D and E in the body of the report. In relation to the provision of schools in a District Plan, I consider this matter primary rests with the Ministry of Education, who have powers as a requiring authority to designate land for schools.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S054.FS.1	S118.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Waikanae Beach	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Waikanae schools are already full and KCDC will need to actively lobby for a new one.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S119	S119.01	Coastal Ratepayers United Inc	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S119.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that 20 identified in the Jacobs Report (Volume 2). We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer areas and Adaptation Zones, those areas will be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and precautionary approaches to decision making.  The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S119	S119.02	Coastal Ratepayers United Inc	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S119.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S120	S120.01	Brown, Melissa	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S120.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that identified in the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report, Jacobs Report Volume 2. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti project and Adaptation Areas, those zones will be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and precautionary approaches to decision making.  The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S120	S120.02	Brown, Melissa	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S120.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S121	S121.01	Gunston, Robin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S121.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that identified in the Jacobs Report (Volume 2). We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Areas seen in GIS Viewer maps online, those areas will be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and precautionary approaches to decision making.  The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S121	S121.02	Gunston, Robin	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S121.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the approach to implement the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act by incorporating a Centres hierarchy and intensification provisions into the KCDC District Plan.  The Kāinga Ora submission as a whole seeks improvements to better align with national direction and achieve regional consistency with this direction. Consequently, a review of the Wellington Region's Centres hierarchy and intensification provisions is considered necessary given the broad range of approaches taken across the Wellington Region.  Examples are provided throughout this submission and include misalignment with National Planning Standard definitions for centres and the notification timing of the PC2 with other District Plans and PC1 to the Regional Policy Statement. There is also a lack of explanation in the s32 documentation for a number of changes relating to the matters above.	<b>Review</b> the Centres hierarchy and commercial and residential intensification provisions in the Commercial and Mixed-Use zones along with replacement of the General Residential Zone with a MRZ and HRZ to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the District.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S122.01.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General	Support primary submission	<i>The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it will achieve consistency across the Wellington Region, however it seeks that the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission is carried over to any new zone provisions.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.</i>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S230.FS.1	S122.01.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	General	Oppose primary submission	<i>Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 &amp; 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S196.FS.1	S122.01.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	General	Support primary submission	<i>Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it will achieve consistency across the Wellington Region, however it seeks that the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission is carried over to any new zone provisions.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission, subject to the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.</i>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S122	S122.02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	<b>Recommend</b> that this re-alignment [referred to in submission point S122.01] across the Wellington region happen ahead of hearings that RPS decisions on these matters are released ahead of District Plans and that KCDC should <b>consider</b> having joint hearing panels for these matters.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	This matter has already been addressed by the Panel at paragraphs 43 to 45 of Minute No. 1.	<b>No recommendation.</b> As Panel has already addressed this matter through Minute No. 1.	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	<b>Accept and include</b> the proposed MRZ chapter provisions sought in Appendix 2 [of the original submission].	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.04	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	<b>Accept and include</b> the proposed HRZ chapter provisions sought in Appendix 3 [of the original submission].	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.05	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General - Density standards	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	<b>Expand</b> Centre Zoning and residential intensification standards to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S122.05.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General - Density standards	Oppose primary submission	<i>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</i> - <i>Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments.</i> - <i>Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</i> - <i>Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential</i> - <i>Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential</i>  <i>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</i> <i>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S122	S122.06	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Walkable catchments	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	<b>Expand</b> the HRZ to apply to areas that are generally: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ; ii. 5-10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from existing and planned rapid transit stops; and iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S122.06.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Walkable catchments	Oppose primary submission	<i>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</i> - <i>Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments.</i> - <i>Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</i> - <i>Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential</i> - <i>Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential</i>  <i>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</i> <i>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S230.FS.1	S122.06.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	Walkable catchments	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.06.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Walkable catchments	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because as mentioned in our primary submission following rapid transit stops to determine residential intensification may not be appropriate. Matters such as the impacts of climate change, lack of infrastructure or high character values need to be given more consideration.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.07	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General Residential Zone	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Seek the spatial extent and properties zoned as General Residential Zone (when notified) are rezoned to the MRZ. See Appendix 4 [of the original submission].	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.07.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General Residential Zone	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S230.FS.1	S122.07.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	General Residential Zone	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.08	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General Residential Zone	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Seek the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts (when notified) are rezoned to HRZ. See Appendix 4 [of the original submission].	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.08.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General Residential Zone	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S230.FS.1	S122.08.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	General Residential Zone	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.09	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Height	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Seek the properties within 400m of a local centre are rezoned MRZ and applied with a maximum height of 18m (to provide for 5 storeys). See Appendix 4 [of the original submission].	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S122.09.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Height	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S230.FS.1	S122.09.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	Height	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kāinga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.10	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Local Centre Zone	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Rezone the site on the corner of Mazengarb Road and The Drive to MRZ. See Appendix 4 [of the original submission].	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	The submitter requests this site be rezoned from Local Centre Zone to General Residential Zone. PC(N) does not propose to change the centres hierarchy, or change the zoning of Metropolitan, Town and Local Centres zones that are part of the centres hierarchy. Rather, PC2 gives effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD based on the Metropolitan, Town and Local Centre zones as they are in the operative District Plan. Rezoning the area as General Residential Zone or any other zone would be inconsistent with the District Plan centres hierarchy (outlined in policy LCZ-P2). Additionally, no evidence has been provided to support this rezoning, and the submitter has also requested intensification of the area surrounding the site as if the Local Centre Zone were to remain in place.	Do not accept.	No.
S236.FS.2	S122.10.FS01	George, Megan; Fenwick, Ian	Local Centre Zone	Oppose primary submission	Oppose MDRS being applied around Mazengarb Road, Guilford Road, and the Avenue intersections. Existing development was not designed with 15-18m buildings among them. Concerns regarding sunlight, privacy, and amenity. There has already been an increase in traffic in this area, streets become gridlocked. Infrastructure is unable to support the amount of growth proposed. The creek floods into surrounding properties. The level of commercial activity in Local Centre is too low to justify 4 storey buildings.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.11	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Residential Intensification Precincts	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Delete the Residential Intensification Precincts.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.12	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	District Plan Maps	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Accept the spatial changes and height limits sought from Kāinga Ora in Appendix 4 [of the original submission] into the Plan.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S230.FS.1	S122.12.FS01	Housiaux, Virginia	District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kāinga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.12.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	Is a suburban area and homeowners have not been consulted. Appropriate to go through full consultation. Is no evidence of any a need for the level of development proposed. One area also runs over Raukawa Marae and the proposed Marae Precinct Zone. Also appears to run over a Te Wānanga o Raukawa area and building.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.13	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General	Support in part	See submission point S122.01	Undertake any consequential changes necessary across the District Plan to address this submission and relief sought.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Where consequential amendments are necessary, these are included as part of recommendations on the submission point to which the amendments relate.	Accept. Noting consequential amendments, where required, are incorporated into recommendations on submission points.	No.
S122	S122.14	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General - Density standards	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the use of standards to address adverse effects across the District Plan. A number of changes to the building height controls have been requested in this submission to help ensure the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act are effectively and efficiently implemented.  There may be a number of other consequential changes needed to standards to give effect to these height adjustments as noted in this submission such as increasing height and associated wind and daylight standards.  These changes should be proportionate to the changes in building height sought to address any transition issues between zones and provide for increased levels of intensification.	Amend standards across the plan to be proportionate to the building height changes sought in this submission (and undertake consequential changes necessary across the District Plan to address the submission and relief sought).	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S230.FS.1	S122.14.FS01	Housiaux, Virginia	General - Density standards	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kāinga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.15	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Method	Oppose	Kāinga Ora request all qualifying matters be controlled by overlays, with overlay provisions contained within the Part 2 General District-Wide section of the District Plan. Qualifying matters are additional provisions that apply to sites and are therefore more appropriately captured and communicated by overlays, rather than zones or precincts.	All qualifying matters be <b>identified</b> by District Plan overlays, with supporting overlay provisions contained within Part 2 General District-Wide section of the District Plan.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	In general, the majority of qualifying matters are provided for through an overlay (I note that there are some zones that are also provided for as qualifying matters, and the reasons for this are outlined in Appendix D to the Section 32 Evaluation Report).  The exception to this is the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and the Marae Takiwā Precinct. I consider it appropriate that these matters are provided for as precincts rather than overlays, because they both constitute place-based provisions that modify the rule and policy approach of the underlying zone. In both cases, the matters being addressed are not district-wide matters (which would be more appropriate to address through an overlay), rather, they are matters specific to identified zones (the General Residential, Local Centre and Town Centre Zones in relation to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and the General Residential and Town Centre Zones in relation to the Marae Takiwā Precinct). I therefore consider it to be more efficient, and consistent with the National Planning Standards, to address these matters through precincts.  In addition to this, I consider it inappropriate to provide for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as a Coastal Hazard Overlay, on the basis that provisions to manage hazards within the area have yet to be determined through a separate plan change. Whether a precinct or overlay is the most appropriate approach to managing those hazards is a matter that should be determined through that plan change.	Do not accept.	No.
S101.FS.1	S122.12.FS01	Toka Tu Ake EQC	Method	Support primary submission	Toka Tu Ake supports the use of qualifying matters to limit development and building in areas subject to natural hazard risk. We support the use of regulatory overlay maps to spatially identify areas at risk and limit inconsistency when applying rules limiting development in these areas.	Allow primary submission point.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.16	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the identification of a coastal hazard as a qualifying matter under s771 and s770 of the RMA, retaining the status quo for development in these areas until such time as a future plan change.  Kāinga Ora does not support the proposed naming of the qualifying matter as a 'Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct' as this does not clearly articulate what the qualifying matter is. Further, Kāinga Ora consider that the qualifying matter, being a hazard, should be identified as a district-wide overlay, with supporting District Plan provisions for the overlay. It is noted that the use of an overlay is consistent with the National Planning Standard in its spatial identification of a risk applying to an area of the District.	<b>Amend</b> reference from the 'Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct' to the 'Coastal Hazard Overlay' throughout the District Plan.  <b>Amend</b> the provisions to provide for the Qualifying Matter as an overlay in the Districtwide chapter of the Plan.  <b>Undertake</b> any consequential changes necessary across the District Plan to address this submission and relief sought.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	As identified in the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter in PC(N), the purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is to: "identify the area within which the level of subdivision and development otherwise required by the Medium Density Residential Standards and policy 3 of the NPS-UD will not be enabled until the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change. The precinct and the provisions associated with it will be reviewed as part of this future plan change process."  I consider 'Coastal Hazard Overlay' to be a less accurate description of the purpose of the precinct, because it implies that the area is subject to a resolved set of coastal hazard provisions, and this is not the case in relation to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. In relation to whether an overlay should be used, I agree that in the case of district-wide natural hazard provisions it would generally be more efficient to provide for these as an overlay. However, as noted above, the function of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not to overlay a resolved set of district-wide coastal hazard provisions in the area. Rather, its function is to maintain the status quo level of development enabled by the provisions of the operative District Plan in the relevant area. This approach requires that the operative provisions of the relevant zone chapters continue to apply in the area. I consider that the most efficient way to achieve this outcome is through a precinct (which provides for modifications to the provisions of individual zones), rather than an overlay (which provides for the application of district-wide provisions in addition to underlying zone provisions).  In summary, I consider that a 'Coastal Hazard Overlay' would be a less appropriate approach to achieving the purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct than the approach taken by the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in PC(N).	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S122.16.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose primary submission	Disagree that development in the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct continue. We also disagree that future development continue beyond the current proposed area of known predicted areas of coastal erosion, inundation, flooding etc identified in the Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Disallow primary submission.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.17	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Design Guides	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guides or design guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with.  Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply 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) sit 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 Guide or 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.  Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.	Kāinga Ora seeks the Design Guides and Design guidelines are <b>removed</b> from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan. A note should be <b>added</b> where reference is made to such guidelines:  <b>Note:</b> <b>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</b>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S122.17.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Design Guides	Support primary submission in part	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission relating to the removal of design guides as this is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow part of the submission where the design guides are removed, but otherwise disallow the submission in relation to retaining design guidelines as a non-statutory tool.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.5	S122.17.FS02	Landlink	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Support the notion that design guides should not be included in the Plan Change in a capacity whereby they act as 'defacto rules to be complied with'. Although good practice design is welcomed and this process has to include flexibility for innovation to cater for unique positive outcomes which sit outside of the scope of the guides.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.17.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Design Guides	Support primary submission in part	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission relating to the removal of design guides as this is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow part of the submission where the design guides are removed, but otherwise disallow the submission in relation to retaining design guidelines as a non-statutory tool.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S122.17.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.17.FS05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.17.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.18	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Design Guides	Oppose	See submission point S122.17	Delete all references to the Design Guides and design guidelines.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S122.18.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Design Guides	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.18.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.18.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.18.FS04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.18.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.19	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Design Guides	Oppose	See submission point S122.17	Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.19.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.19.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.19.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.20	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Design Guides	Oppose	See submission point S122.17	If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the Design Guides and design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the S42A report for details.	Yes. Amend GRZ-Px6. Refer section 4.4 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the S42A report.
S100.FS.1	S122.20.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.20.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.20.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.21	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Design Guides	Oppose	See submission point S122.17	If the relief sought in [submission points S122.17 to S122.20] is not granted, Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.22	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Design Guides	Oppose	See submission point S122.17	Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought [in submission points S122.17 to S122.21].	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.23	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'ACCESS SITE'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the definition of "Access Site", noting that this new term provides for greater certainty with regard to sites that cannot be constructed on.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.24	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'ANCESTRAL LAND'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition, noting it is consistent with section 6 of the Act.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	I note that amendments to this definition have been sought by Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai [S100] and Ngāti Toa Rangatira [S161], and I have made recommendations to amend accordingly.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations to amend this definition through other submissions.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.24.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition of 'ANCESTRAL LAND'	Oppose primary submission	Ātiawa propose, through our primary submission, a definition that is consistent with the intent of papakāinga, and we do not recognise the authority of Crown agencies to define matters of tikanga Māori. Amend the proposed definition to: "Ancestral Land means land where tangata whenua have an undisturbed collective whakapapa relationship." and any consequential amendments including reference to the definition in the Papakāinga Chapter introduction.	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.25	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'DRIVEWAY (IN RELATION TO OUTLOOK SPACE)'	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the definition of "Driveway (in relation to outlook space)", noting that this new term provides for greater certainty with regard to sites that cannot be constructed on. The definition should only refer to access terms defined in the District Plan.	<b>Amend</b> definition of 'Driveway (in relation to outlook space)' as follows: <b>DRIVEWAY (IN RELATION TO OUTLOOK SPACE):</b> <a href="#">means an access way, leg, site or access strip designed and constructed for use by motor vehicles, pedestrians or cyclists</a>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree that it would improve interpretation of the definition to use terms that are defined either in the District Plan or the RMA.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the definition of DRIVEWAY (IN RELATION TO OUTLOOK SPACE) (refer section 20.3 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves interpretation of the definition by incorporating terms that are already defined in the District Plan or in the RMA.
S122	S122.26	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'ENTRANCE STRIP'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition to clarify the terms used for the same type of access.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.27	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'GENERAL TITLE LAND (IN RELATION TO PAPAKĀINGA)'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition, noting it is consistent with section 8 of the Act.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.28	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'LAND DEVELOPMENT MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this definition to include an updated reference to the relevant document, and the location of this document outside the District Plan.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.29	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'MEDIUM DENSITY HOUSING'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this deletion of this definition.	<b>Delete</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.30	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS or MDRS'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of this definition to confirm how this term should be interpreted in the District Plan.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.31	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'NOISE SENSITIVE ACTIVITY'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the amendment to this definition to include specific reference to <a href="#">papakāinga</a> .	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.32	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'PAPAKĀINGA'	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to this definition, but seek some amendments to be more regionally and nationally consistent.	<b>Amend</b> definition of 'Papakāinga' as follows: <b>PAPAKĀINGA</b> <a href="#">PAPAKĀINGA means housing and any ancillary activities (including social, cultural, educational, recreational, conservation and/or commercial activities) to support the cultural, environmental and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua on their ancestral land</a>	4.3 Papakāinga	The definition of papakāinga was developed with significant input from tangata whenua, and I note that Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai [S100.45], have submitted in support of this definition, seeking that it be retained. I therefore consider it appropriate to retain the provision generally as drafted.  However, I do consider that the amendment requested to include "or" in the list of activities is helpful as it clarifies that ancillary activities need not be all of those activities identified in the list.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Minor amendment to replace and with or.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend definition of PAPAKĀINGA. Refer section 20.10 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a clearer, more efficient and effective interpretation of the definition.
S100.FS.1	S122.32.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Definition of 'PAPAKĀINGA'	Oppose primary submission	<i>Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori. Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. Conservation is not a term that adequately describes the cultural relationship of Ātiawa with their lands and waters, and we do not recognise the authority of Crown agencies to define matters of tikanga. Retain as notified</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.3 Papakāinga	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S122	S122.33	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'QUALIFYING MATTER AREA'	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this definition, noting it is consistent with section 2 of the RMA, but: 1. requests for clarity that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be renamed as Coastal Hazard Precinct 2. requests the General Residential Zone be changed to the Medium Density Residential Zone, consistent with other points raised in this submission.	<b>Amend</b> definition of 'Qualifying Matter Area' as follows: 1. Replace the term Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with Coastal Hazard Precinct. 2. Replace the term General Residential Zone with Medium Density Residential Zone.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I have outlined in my assessment under submission point S122.16 why I do not consider it appropriate to replace the term Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with Coastal Hazard Precinct.  I have outlined in my assessment under section 4.4.4 of the body of the report why I do not consider it appropriate to replace the General Residential Zone with a Medium Density Residential Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.34	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'RELEVANT RESIDENTIAL ZONE'	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of this definition, but restates its position that there should be a Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) and a High Density Residential Zone (HRZ).	<b>Amend</b> definition of 'Relevant Residential Area' as follows: <b>RELEVANT RESIDENTIAL ZONE</b> <a href="#">means the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone or the High Density Residential Zone</a>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.35	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'TINO RANGATIRATANGA'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this definition.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.36	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'TIPUNA/TUPUNA'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this definition.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.37	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'YARD'	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this definition.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.38	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'RAPID TRANSIT STOP'	Not specified	Kāinga Ora seeks the introduction of a new definition for "Rapid Transit Stop". This definition aligns with that proposed by Hutt City Council and is consistent with the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD.	<b>Proposed</b> new definition: <b>Rapid Transit Stop</b> <a href="#">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.</a>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the proposed definition requested by the submitter would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD in the Kāpiti context. Specifically, the Capital Connection rail service, which travels between Palmerston North and Wellington, and stops at Ōtaki railway station, could be considered as a regularly scheduled passenger service. However, it is only scheduled to run once per day. As such, I do not consider it to meet the definition of a rapid transit service outlined in the NPS-UD, as it is not a frequent passenger service.  The new definition requested by the submitter would therefore have the effect of making Ōtaki railway station a rapid transit stop, despite the fact that it is not serviced by a rapid transit service. I consider this to be inconsistent with the NPS-UD, and I do not consider it necessary to depart from the definition of <i>rapid transit stop</i> included in the NPS-UD by including a definition within the District Plan.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S053.FS.1	S122.38.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Definition of 'RAPID TRANSIT STOP'	Support primary submission	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).	Allow primary submission point.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.39	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Definition of 'INFILL'	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to remove reference to "infill" housing. Kāinga Ora notes this term, where it refers to 'focussed infill' is proposed for deletion through PC2.	<b>Delete</b> definition of 'INFILL': <b>infill- means subdivision or development of a site of less than 3,000m<sup>2</sup> in area.</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree with the submitter that this definition is no longer necessary because of the removal of the Focussed Infill Precinct from the District Plan. I consider that removing the definition will avoid confusion and improve interpretation of the District Plan.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Delete the definition of INFILL from the Interpretation chapter of the District Plan. Refer to section 20.17 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves interpretation of the District Plan by removing a definition that is no longer necessary as a result of removal of the Focussed Infill Precinct from the District Plan.
S122	S122.40	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO - Chapter Introduction	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the numerical reference.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.41	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this objective in part, but: • seeks an amendment so as not to be overly constraining of where urban intensification can occur; and • notes that the matters contained within do not form a Qualifying Matter in which to limit application of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O3 as follows: <b>To maintain a consolidated urban form within existing urban areas and a limited number of identified growth areas, which and to provide for the development of new urban areas where these can be efficiently serviced and integrated with existing townships centres, delivering:</b> ...	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider the amendments requested by the submitter to be necessary to incorporate the MDRS or give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. I consider that the focus of the Objective, which generally seeks a consolidated urban form, while providing for the development of new urban areas where these can be integrated and serviced with existing urban areas, is appropriate, and I do not consider there to be a compelling reason to depart from this approach.  I do not consider that the matters contained within DO-O3 (as amended by PC2) of themselves have the effect of providing for a level of development that is less than the MDRS of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD (although separate provisions related to qualifying matters may have this effect on a site specific basis).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S122.41.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-O3	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.5	S122.41.FS02	Landlink	DO-O3	Support primary submission	As per Landlink's primary submission - do not believe the proposed rezoning of 13 areas will give effect to the NPS-UD, particularly policy 3 and subsequently Policies 1 & 2. Therefore, this submission supports the policy intent to develop 'new urban areas' in certain circumstances, particularly in situations where a viable case can be made for a new urban area in line with other relevant policy provisions e.g. National Policy Statements.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.41.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.41.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O3	Oppose primary submission	Ātiawa seeks growth that both retains the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. Housing should be supported by life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs. The tino rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi should be recognised in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Maintaining a consolidated urban form supports Ātiawa's objectives in that regard. Retain as notified.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.42	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective, but notes 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 also requests the removal of reference to 'existing' urban environments to provide for the potential for development in other urban environments that may be developed in the future.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O3 as follows: ... The approach to managing these challenges is to: <b>enable more people to live within Kāpiti's existing urban environments, particularly where these are well connected to transport, infrastructure, commercial activities and community services;...</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree that the amendment to the explanation requested by the submitter would better align with objective DO-O3, which seeks to provide for both existing and new urban environments.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the explanatory text to DO-O3. Refer to section 1.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves better aligns the explanatory text to DO-O3 with the provision for both existing and new urban environments outlined under objective DO-O3.
S206.FS.5	S122.42.FS01	Landlink	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	As per Landlink's primary submission - do not believe the proposed rezoning of 13 areas will give effect to the NPS-UD, particularly policy 3 and subsequently Policies 1 & 2. Therefore, this submission supports the policy intent to develop 'new urban areas' in certain circumstances, particularly in situations where a viable case can be made for a new urban area in line with other relevant policy provisions e.g. National Policy Statements.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.42.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose primary submission	Ātiawa seeks growth that both retains the ability for our people to live in their own rohe, and create housing opportunities that attract our own people home as part of the growing population. Housing should be supported by life sustaining infrastructure including improved public transport hubs. The tino rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi should be recognised in relation to their land and waterways, and how this can be exercised to better manage the sustainable use of these resources. Maintaining a consolidated urban form supports Ātiawa's objectives in that regard. Retain as notified.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.43	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective, noting it incorporates the objectives of Clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the Act.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.44	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective, noting it incorporates the objectives of Clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the Act.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.45	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora does not support the approach of applying the General Residential Zone across the district, incorporating identified Residential Intensification Precincts as a planning tool to enable focused intensification. It is noted that this approach is inconsistent with that otherwise being taken by other councils in the greater Wellington region and does not provide the same degree of transparency with regard to the scale and extent of development that is being enabled by the underlying precincts and as directed by the NPS-UD. Kāinga Ora seeks the introduction of a distinct zoning framework to give clear effect to the intensification policy of the NPS-UD. In particular, Kāinga Ora seeks the introduction of a Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ), which could incorporate a control or precinct to enable additional height and density of urban built form in areas directed by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Kāinga Ora would also support the introduction of a High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) in locations where development of at least 6 storeys is to be enabled, such as land located within proximity to the city centre and/or train stations.	1. <b>Delete</b> the Residential Intensification Precincts and replace with a MRZ and HRZ chapter and relevant objectives. Reasons outlined in this submission. 2. <b>Delete</b> this objective (DO-Ox3).	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S122.45.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-Ox3	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD, and will enable consistency across the greater Wellington region, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission being applied to any new MRZ and HRZ chapters.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S230.FS.1	S122.45.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	DO-Ox3	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.45.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	DO-Ox3	Support primary submission	Ryman supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD, and will enable consistency across the greater Wellington region, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission being applied to any new MRZ and HRZ chapters.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.46	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.47	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this explanatory text, but notes that the matters contained within do not form a Qualifying Matter in which to limit application of Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.48	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O16	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to introduce higher density development, but requests changes to reflect the increase in development capacity requested throughout this submission.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O16 as follows: ... <b>5. provide for higher density urban built character and high-quality development, including:</b> <b>b. buildings up to 4215-storeys within the Metropolitan Centre Zone;</b> <b>c. buildings up to 68-storeys within:</b> <b>i. the Town Centre Zone;</b> <b>ii. the Ihakara Street West, Ihakara Street East and Kapiti Road precincts of the Mixed Use Zone;</b> <b>iii. the Local Centre Zone at Paekākāriki; and</b> <b>d. buildings up to 46-storeys within the Local Centre Zone.</b>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S085.FS.1	S122.48.FS01	Houston, David	DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the submission by Kainga Ora requesting building heights of 18m. Opposes due to inundation and predicted coastal erosion.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202.FS.1	S122.48.FS02	Leith Consulting Ltd	DO-O16	Support primary submission	Agree that buildings of up to 6 stories should be provided within the Local Centre Zone. Aligns with the intent and relief sought in primary submission.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097.FS.1	S122.48.FS03	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S230.FS.1	S122.48.FS04	Housiaux, Virginia	DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.48.FS05	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents. Reject submission points S122.48 & S122.58.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161.FS.1	S122.48.FS06	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.48.FS07	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O16	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.49	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-O16 (Explanatory Text)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this explanatory text.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.50	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated provision for papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.51	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.52	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.53	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.54	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.55	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.56	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.57	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox10 (Explanatory Text)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this explanatory text to include updated references to papakāinga.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.58	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-Px	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the introduction of this policy, subject to: • the deletion of reference to the General Residential Zone, as requested elsewhere in this submission, and replacement with reference to a Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone • incorporation of amended provision for height, as requested elsewhere in this submission.	Amend UFD-Px as follows: <a href="#">Provide for heights and densities of urban built form that enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, the District's urban environments, by:</a> <a href="#">1. enabling the greatest building heights and densities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, including buildings up to 1215-stores;</a> <a href="#">2. enabling greater building heights and densities within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone, including buildings up to 12-stores;</a> <a href="#">3. enabling greater buildings heights and densities within a walkable catchment of and the train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae, including buildings up to 6-stores;</a> <a href="#">4. enabling greater building heights and densities in the Town Centre Zone, including buildings up to 6- stores;</a> <a href="#">5. enabling increased building heights and densities in the Local Centre Zone, including buildings up to 4 5- stores;</a> <a href="#">6. enabling increased building heights and densities adjacent to the Town Centre Zone, and adjacent to the Local Centre Zone, including buildings up to 4- 5-6 stores; and</a> <a href="#">7. enabling a variety of building heights and densities in the General-Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone, including buildings up to 3-stores; while avoiding inappropriate buildings, activities, heights and densities within qualifying matter areas.</a>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.58.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S230.FS.1	S122.58.FS02	Housiaux, Virginia	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	Object to the reclassification, rezoning, and height changes requested by Kainga Ora. Object to replacing the General Residential Zone with MRZ and HRZ. The original classification, zoning maps and descriptions provided by KCDC were an appropriate response to the government's required changes and to support housing growth in appropriate areas. The changes proposed by this submitter are overly extensive and do not keep with the local unique character of the Kapiti Coast and specifically the Paraparaumu Beach area. Turning this area (outlined in appendix 4 maps sheet 6 & 7) into a high density housing zones with the height they are proposing will destroy this unique character and put significant pressure on already strained infrastructure - e.g. stormwater drains and pollution.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S236.FS.1	S122.58.FS03	George, Megan; Fenwick, Ian	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	Oppose MDRS being applied around Mazengarb Road, Guilford Road, and the Avenue intersections. Existing development was not designed with 15-18m buildings among them. Concerns regarding sunlight, privacy, and amenity. There has already been an increase in traffic in this area, streets become gridlocked. Infrastructure is unable to support the amount of growth proposed. The creek floods into surrounding properties. Consideration should be made of geotechnical, sea level rise, extreme weather, earthquake impacts. This is a suburban area not near railway station or main shopping centres.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S122.58.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents. Reject submission points S122.48 & S122.58.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.58.FS05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.58.FS06	Nga Hapū o Ōtaki	UFD-Px	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.59	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this policy, subject to: • an amendment so as not to be overly constraining of where urban intensification can occur; and • the deletion of reference to the General Residential Zone, as requested elsewhere in this submission, and replacement with reference to a Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P1 as follows: New urban development for residential activities <del>will only be located within existing urban areas and identified growth areas, and</del> will be undertaken in a manner which: 1. supports the District's consolidated urban form; 2. maintains the integrity of the urban edge north of Waikanae and Ōtaki; 3. manages residential densities by: a. providing for a variety of housing types and densities in the <b>General Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone</b> ; b. enabling increased housing densities: i. in and within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone; ii. within a walkable catchment of the train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae; and iii. in and adjacent to the Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone; 4. avoids urban expansion that would compromise the distinctiveness of existing settlements and unique character values in the rural environment between and around settlements; 5. can be sustained within and makes efficient use of existing capacity of public services and strategic-infrastructure, or is integrated with the planned capacity of public services and infrastructure; and 6. promotes the efficient use of energy and water.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S122.59.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P1	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.5	S122.59.FS02	Landlink	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	As per Landlink's primary submission - do not believe the proposed rezoning of 13 areas will give effect to the NPS-UD, particularly policy 3 and subsequently Policies 1 & 2. Therefore, this submission supports the policy intent to develop 'new urban areas' in certain circumstances, particularly in situations where a viable case can be made for a new urban area in line with other relevant policy provisions e.g. National Policy Statements.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.60	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P2	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this policy, subject to amendments to recognise that residential activities encompass a wide range of housing and living arrangements. This includes transitional housing, emergency housing, community housing and multi-generational living.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P2 as follows: An increased mix of housing forms, and types, sizes and tenures will be encouraged within parts of the District where increased variety and densities of housing are able to cater for changing demographics, while maintaining encouraging high amenity values. This will include provision for: 1. smaller household sizes, including 1 and 2 bedroom typologies and residential units; 2. housing for older persons; 3. supported living accommodation; 4. papakāinga papakāinga ; 5. shared and group accommodation, including community housing and multi-generational living; 6. transitional and emergency housing; 7. minor residential units; and 8. a range of allotment sizes and land tenure arrangements to facilitate these typologies.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The amendments requested by the submitter recognise the need to provide for a variety of housing types that respond to the needs of the community. I consider that the amendments requested improve the consistency of the policy with Policy 1(a) of the NPS-UD and proposed district objective DO-Ox2 (which is a mandatory MDRS objective required under clause 6(1)(b) of Schedule 3A to the RMA).	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P2. Refer to section 2.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because the amendments improve recognition of the need to provide for a variety of housing types in a manner that is consistent with Policy 1(a) of the NPS-UD and proposed district objective DO-Ox2. I consider that the amendment supports incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan.
S206.FS.5	S122.60.FS01	Landlink	UFD-P2	Support primary submission	Support broadening policy scope for a varied provision of housing in the region which can meet the communities broad range of needs.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.61	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this policy.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.62	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P4	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this policy, subject to the deletion of reference to the General Residential Zone, as requested elsewhere in this submission, and replacement with reference to a Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P4 as follows: The density of <i>subdivision and development</i> will be managed through an area-specific approach to achieve an appropriate range of housing types across the District, as set out below: 1. the highest densities, including apartments as part of mixed use developments, will be located within and in immediate proximity to centres; 2. <i>medium density housing</i> will be limited to specific precinct areas within walking distance of centres - higher density development, including multi-storey apartments, will be provided for within a walkable catchment of the <i>Metropolitan Centre Zone</i> , train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae, and adjacent to the <i>Town Centre Zone</i> and <i>Local Centre Zone</i> ; 3. focused infill will be encouraged in specific areas where there is good access to shops and services - a variety of densities will be provided for in the <i>General-Medium Density Residential Zone</i> and <i>High Density Residential Zone</i> ; 4. within the Neighbourhood Development Areas identified in the Ngārara Development Area Structure Plan in Appendix 7, the provision of affordable housing will be encouraged at appropriate locations with good access to shops and services; and 5. 8 - in areas where infrastructure constraints exist (such as water, wastewater or roading) - densities will reflect these constraints, residential densities will be integrated with existing or planned infrastructure capacity. ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.62.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P4	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.63	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed deletion of this policy, noting these matters are addressed through the new 'Papakāinga' chapter.	Delete UFD-P5 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.64	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P11	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this policy.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.65	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	UFD-P13	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the changes to this objective, subject to: • the deletion of the GRZ chapter from the list of zone and replacement with MRZ and HRZ chapters, as requested elsewhere in this submission; • the renaming of the 'Coastal Qualifying Matter' as the 'Coastal Hazard Overlay'.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P13 as follows: Subdivision, use and development in the Residential Zones will be managed through the following zoning framework: 1. <b>General Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone, including the following areas precincts:</b> a. <b>Medium Density Housing (also located within various Centres Zones) Residential Intensification;</b> b. <b>Focused Infill Coastal Qualifying Matter Hazard Overlay;</b> c. <b>Waikanae Garden Precinct;</b> d. <b>Low Density (at Ōtaki, County Road Ōtaki, Paraparaumu and Manu Grove Low Density Housing) County Road Ōtaki Precinct;</b> e. <b>Pekawau;</b> f. <b>Ferndale Area;</b> g. <b>Panorama Drive;</b> h. <b>Waikanae Golf;</b> i. <b>The Drive Extension;</b> e. <b>Beach Residential Precinct;</b> f. <b>Marae Takiwā Precinct;</b> 2. Ngārara Development Area; and 3. Waikanae North Development Area.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider it appropriate to amend the policy to refer to Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones, or to refer to a Coastal Hazard Overlay, for reasons I have identified in my recommendations in response to the submission points on these matters.  However, I consider that the amendments requested to refer to the listed areas as Precincts would improve interpretation of the policy.	Accept in part. By amending the policy to insert the term "Precinct" after each Precinct.	Yes. Amend UFD-P13. Refer to section 2.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves interpretation of the policy by making it clear that the areas referred to in the policy are precincts identified in the District Plan.
S097.FS.1	S122.65.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P13	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.66	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TR-P1	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.67	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TR-P2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the introduction of the policy to clearly provide for sustainable transport.	Retain as notified.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.68	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TR-R1	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule.	Retain as notified.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.69	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TR-R9	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule.	Retain as notified.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.70	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TR-R10	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule.	Retain as notified.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.71	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	NH-FLOOD	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the identification of flood hazards as qualifying matters, in line with the requirements of the Act.  Kāinga Ora considers that the extent of flooding along stream corridors and all other flood hazard mapping should not be included in the District Plan and is more appropriately located outside the District Plan and as a non-statutory document.	Remove reference to flood hazard mapping within the chapter and identify all flood hazard mapping as a non-statutory document.  Consequential amendments will be required to remove and amend references to the flood hazard mapping.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Flood hazard mapping was incorporated into the operative District Plan through a Schedule 1 process, and PC2 does not propose to change this. I consider substantial evaluation would be required in order to justify why it would be appropriate to remove the existing flood hazard mapping from the District Plan, and I do not consider this to be justified in the submission.	Do not accept.	No.
S101.FS.1	S122.71.FS01	Toka Tu Ake EQC	NH-FLOOD	Oppose primary submission	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard map overlays are an important tool in Kapiti Plan Change 2 to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to identified natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory overlays, 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 Tu Ake encourages the use and expansion of regulatory flood-hazard maps based on up-to-date science and modelling.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S097.FS.1	S122.71.FS02	Greater Wellington Regional Council	NH-FLOOD	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek to remove reference to flood hazard mapping within the District Plan and identify all flood mapping as a non-statutory document. 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 document.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S236.FS.4	S122.71.FS03	George, Megan; Fenwick, Ian	NH-FLOOD	Oppose primary submission	Submitter lives next to a creek and have seen the impact of housing intensification. The stream used to flood every 3 years, now floods every significant rainfall. Having reference to flood hazards removed from the District Plan is concerning, as is rezoning and intensification. Information about flood hazards are vital to all future planning, especially in given climate change and the topography.	Disallow primary submission.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.72	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule.	Retain as notified.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting that I have recommended amendments to this rule in response to other submissions.	No.
S122	S122.73	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-DW District Wide Subdivision Matters - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the updating of references to the 'Land Development Minimum Requirements' and supports this document sitting outside the District Plan.	Retain as notified.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.74	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-P1	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendment to this policy.	Retain as notified.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I have recommended that this policy be deleted under submission point S028.41.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.75	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES Subdivision in Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the updating of references to the 'Land Development Minimum Requirements' and supports this document sitting outside the District Plan.  Kāinga Ora also supports the updating of references to the correct rules and policy references to reflect changes in other parts of the Subdivision chapter.	Retain as notified.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.76	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES Subdivision in Residential Zones - All Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the lack of use of a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities and seeks that this is applied to all restricted discretionary activities.  The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches.	Amend SUB-RES to include a non-notification preclusion statement for all Restricted Discretionary Activity rules as follows: <b>Notification:</b> <a href="#">Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.</a>	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	only consider it necessary to preclude public and limited notification from the subdivision rules where this is required by clause 5(3) of Schedule 3A to the RMA. In the case of the SUB-RES chapter (and based on my recommended amendments to the rule cascade discussed in the body of the report), this applies only to rules SUB-RES-Rx1 and SUB-RES-R30.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.76.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-RES Subdivision in Residential Zones - All Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules	Oppose primary submission	Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process. Decision sought: Reject submission points S122.76 & S122.83.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.76.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES Subdivision in Residential Zones - All Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules	Oppose primary submission	Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.77	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R26	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule, subject to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be renamed as the Coastal Hazard Precinct, as requested elsewhere in this submission.	Amendments sought.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	As outlined in response to submission point S122.16 I do not recommend changing the name of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.78	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-Rx1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the inclusion of this rule subject to changes requested to SUB-RES-Table x1.	Amendments sought.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Support is noted. Refer to my assessment under submission point S122.80 in relation to amendments requested to table SUB-RES-Table x1.	Accept in part. Noting that I have recommended amendments to this rule in response to other submissions.	No.
S122	S122.79	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-R27	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule.	Retain as notified.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting that I have recommended amendments to this rule in response to other submissions.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.80	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-RES-Table x1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the use of a shape factor, but opposes the use of a minimum lot size, for residential subdivisions.  For the MRZ, Kāinga Ora considers a 8m x 15m is appropriate to provide a medium density developable site with appropriate levels of amenity.  For the HRZ, a shape factor of 8m x 15m is appropriate to provide for the level of development sought in that zone.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-Table x1 as follows: 1. <b>Remove</b> minimum lot size, and seek for a new standard added on vacant shape factor applies to MRZ and HRZ as follows: <b>MRZ</b> - All vacant allotments must be able to contain a rectangle measuring 8m x 15m clear of any yards, access allotments and right-of-way. <b>HRZ</b> - All vacant allotments must be able to contain a rectangle measuring 8m x 15m clear of any yards, access allotments and right-of-way. 2. Consequential <b>amendments</b> may be required to give effect to this relief sought in the Plan.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	While I consider that the minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor could be reduced to be more consistent with the MDRS, I am mindful that a vacant allotment, once subdivided, will enable the construction of 3 dwellings on that single vacant allotment as a permitted activity (not one). I is not clear to me from the information contained in the submission that an 8 metre x 15 metre rectangle is sufficient to accommodate 3 residential units.  I note that the Ministry for the Environment's Medium Density Residential Standards factsheet (see <a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf</a> ) illustrate three potential MDRS development outcomes each based on an approximate 420m2 site area and a minimum site width of 13 metres. On this basis, I consider it appropriate to reduce the minimum vacant allotment size to 420m2 and shape factor to 13 metres.  In any case, I note that: - There is no minimum allotment size or shape factor for allotments that have an approved land use consent (and this would include where land use consent is bundled with the subdivision consent); - In response to submission point S202.04, I have recommended that there be no minimum allotment size or shape factor where it can be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct residential units on the allotment that comply with rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 and GRZ-Rx3.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend the minimum vacant allotment area to 420m2 and the minimum vacant allotment shape factor to 13 metres.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-Table x1. Refer to section 10.13 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor that is more consistent with the level of development anticipated by the MDRS.
S206.FS.5	S122.80.FS01	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Support primary submission	Do not support the retention of minimum lot sizes and a XXm diameter circle for residential subdivision - see Landlink primary submission for further detail. General advice (Quality Planning) outlines that 'the non-complying activity status is intended for situations where it is intended consents only be granted in exceptional circumstances'. Given the potential permitted baseline through land use retaining a non-complying activity status for subdivisions which do not meet minimum 450m lot size or 15m diameter circle is overly restrictive and not conducive to the implementation of the NPS-UD. Suggest a new minimum lot size is determined through analysis of size of lots that MDRH can be reasonably facilitated on - retention of 450m2 reflects older provisions of the District Plan which did not account for MDRH. Acknowledge that this is a complex area and work may be constrained given short timeframes, but a well considered new minimum lot size (if retention of a minimum lot size is considered appropriate) will likely lead to better urban design outcomes.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.81	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the updating of references to the 'Land Development Minimum Requirements' and support this document sitting outside the District Plan.	Retain as notified.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.82	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - Design Guides	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under the relevant rule and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Delete all references to the Centres Design Guide.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.82.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.82.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.82.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - Design Guides	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.83	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - All Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the lack of use of a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities and seeks that this is applied to all restricted discretionary activities. The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-WORK to include a non-notification preclusion statement for all Restricted Discretionary Activity rules as follows: <b>Notification:</b> Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I only consider it necessary to preclude public and limited notification from the subdivision rules where this is required by clause 5(3) of Schedule 3A to the RMA. This does not apply to any subdivision rules in the SUB-WORK chapter (which relates to subdivision in the centres, mixed use, hospital and industrial zones).  While the standards under the rules may be technical in nature, I do not consider this to be a key issue, as the standards must be complied with in any case. Rather it is the effects associated with the matters of discretion that must be considered where relevant, and these effects may go beyond being purely technical matters (and will vary depending on the specific nature of the subdivision). I do not think it is certain that there will not be adverse effects on other persons as a result of subdivision under these rules, so I do not consider notification preclusions to be sufficiently justified.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.83.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - All Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules	Oppose primary submission	Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process. Decision sought: Reject submission points S122.76 & S122.83.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S122.83.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	SUB-WORK Subdivision in Working Zones - All Restricted Discretionary Activity Rules	Oppose primary submission	Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.84	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK-R40	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule to allow for proposals exceeding the permitted height threshold in the MCZ to be assessed as a RDA.  Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under the relevant rule and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Delete all references to the Centres Design Guide in SUB-WORK-R40.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.84.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK-R40	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.84.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	SUB-WORK-R40	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.84.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	SUB-WORK-R40	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.85	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK-R41	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule to allow for proposals exceeding the permitted height threshold in the MUZ to be assessed as a RDA.  Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under the relevant rule and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Delete all references to the Centres Design Guide in SUB-WORK-R41.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.85.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK-R41	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.85.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	SUB-WORK-R41	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.85.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	SUB-WORK-R41	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.86	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK-R42	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule to allow for proposals exceeding the permitted height threshold in the TCZ to be assessed as a RDA.  Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under the relevant rule and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Delete all references to the Centres Design Guide in SUB-WORK-R42.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.86.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK-R42	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.86.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	SUB-WORK-R42	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.86.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	SUB-WORK-R42	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.87	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK-R43	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule to allow for proposals exceeding the permitted height threshold in the LCZ to be assessed as a RDA.  Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under the relevant rule and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Delete all references to the Centres Design Guide in SUB-WORK-R43.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S122.87.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK-R43	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.87.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	SUB-WORK-R43	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.87.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-WORK-R43	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.88	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	SUB-WORK-R44	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule to allow for proposals exceeding the permitted height threshold in the HOSZ to be assessed as a RDA.  Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under the relevant rule and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Delete all references to the Centres Design Guide in SUB-WORK-R44.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.88.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	SUB-WORK-R44	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.88.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	SUB-WORK-R44	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.88.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-WORK-R44	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.89	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FC-P3	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed policy but seeks amendments to the proposed wording due to its ambiguous intent.	1. <b>Amendments</b> sought to FC-P3 to reduce ambiguity about when financial contributions are incurred. 2. <b>Amend</b> FC-P3 as follows: <u>A financial contribution may be required for any land use or subdivision application only where potential or actual adverse effects of a development cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated through on site measures to ensure positive effects on the environment are achieved to offset any adverse effects that cannot otherwise be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u>	4.17 Financial Contributions	I consider that the wording of the notified provision is clear, and closely related to the wording used in sections 77E(2)(a) and 108(10)(a), which provide for financial contributions "for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to offset any adverse effect". I consider that the submitter's proposed wording departs from this purpose (which relates to ensuring positive effects are achieved).  I also consider that replacing "may be" with "is" is not appropriate, as it suggests that financial contributions are a mandatory method for to achieve offsetting. I prefer "may be", as this retains flexibility for other forms of offsetting to be considered where appropriate to the circumstances.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.90	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Papakāinga - Chapter Introduction	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed text.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that I recommend amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations to amend this provision in response to other submissions.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.90.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Papakāinga - Chapter Introduction	Support primary submission	Ātiawa support the retention of the provisions for papakāinga in the: The General Residential Zone The General Rural Zone The Rural Production Zone The Rural Lifestyle Zone The Future Urban Zone The Town Centre Zone. Papakāinga should also be provided for in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed Use Zones as Ātiawa have not finalised our Treaty of Waitangi Settlement with the Crown it is therefore inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from our rohe. Further, our relationship with our lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries. Therefore, in line with the purpose of this Chapter, which includes a range of activities including commercial activity, it is appropriate to enable papakāinga in all Zones. Provide for papakāinga in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed Use Zones	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.90.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Papakāinga - Chapter Introduction	Support primary submission	NHoO support the retention of the provisions for papakāinga in the: The General Residential Zone The General Rural Zone The Rural Production Zone The Rural Lifestyle Zone The Future Urban Zone The Town Centre Zone. Papakāinga should also be provided for in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed Use Zones as NHoO have not finalised our Treaty of Waitangi Settlement with the Crown it is therefore inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from our rohe. Further, our relationship with our lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries. Therefore, in line with the purpose of this Chapter, which includes a range of activities including commercial activity, it is appropriate to enable papakāinga in all Zones.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.91	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox4	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.92	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.93	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.94	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox7	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.95	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox8	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.96	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox9	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.97	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	DO-Ox10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed objective.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.98	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	PK-Px1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.98.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px1	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.98.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PK-Px1	Support primary submission	NHoO oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. Decision sought: In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.99	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	PK-Px2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.99.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px2	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.100	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	PK-Px3	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.100.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px3	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.101	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	PK-Px4	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed policy but considers that there is potential conflict within the wording of the policy. The need to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on neighbouring properties is at odds with the overall intention of the policy, which relates to the maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development.	Amend PK-Px4 as follows: ... <a href="#">The maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development will be determined by the limitations of the site, including:</a> <a href="#">1. adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure to serve the papakāinga; and</a> <a href="#">2. adverse effects on adjoining properties and the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated;</a> <a href="#">while recognising that papakāinga may contain activities of a character, scale, intensity or range that are not provided for in the surrounding area.</a>	4.3 Papakāinga	I agree with the submitter, and consider that because adjoining properties are a subset of the environment more broadly, the reference to adjoining properties is unnecessary.	Accept.	Yes. Amend PK-Px4. Refer section 20.10 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a clearer (and therefore more efficient) policy without unnecessary duplication.
S100.FS.1	S122.101.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px4	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.102	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	PK-Px5	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed policy subject to inclusion of conservation activities.	Amend PK-Px5 as follows: Amend to provide for conservation activities in the list of non-residential activities	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to S122.32.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.102.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px5	Oppose primary submission	Papakāinga are a taonga that enable tangata whenua to live on and be sustained by their ancestral land in accordance with tikanga Māori. Papakāinga development should enable Māori to live as Māori, and should support tangata whenua to thrive as a community. Conservation is not a term that adequately describes the cultural relationship of Ātiawa with their lands and waters, and we do not recognise the authority of Crown agencies to define matters of tikanga. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.102.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px5	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.103	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	PK-Px6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.103.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	PK-Px6	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.104	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Advice Notes	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed text.	Retain as notified	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that I recommend amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations to amend this provision in response to other submissions.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S122.104.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Advice Notes	Support primary submission	Ātiawa oppose the PC2 proposal to enable development on the basis of planned infrastructure. However, in the event that this is retained through PC2, it is critical that an appropriate level of equity is provided in the way that policies are implemented. Therefore, PK-Px4 should be amended to also enable papakāinga on the basis of planned infrastructure. In the event that our decision sought regarding the inclusion of Infrastructure as a New Qualifying Matter is rejected, we seek the following amendment: "adequate provision of on-site or off-site infrastructure or planned infrastructure"	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.105	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	District Plan wide – activity status for papakāinga developments	Support in part	Kāinga Ora note that the activity status provided for papakāinga development within zones differs for general title land (Restricted Discretionary Activity) compared to land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 (Permitted Activity) where compliance with standards is achieved. Kāinga Ora considers the same status should apply, particularly where the same protections are in place to retain Māori land in general title.	Amend the rule framework so that papakāinga development on land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and land held in general title, with the same protections as are provided by the Act, is provided for as a Permitted Activity.	4.3 Papakāinga	Consideration was given to this matter during the drafting of the provisions. This is outlined in the Section 32 Evaluation Report (pp.108-109), which states: "Iwi expressed concern at the restricted discretionary activity status for papakāinga on general title land. The Council considered permitted activity status, but found that there would not be a sufficiently certain permitted activity standard that could address the issue of demonstrating an ancestral connection to the land. The following have been incorporated into the provisions in order to address iwi concerns: - Policy PK-Px1 clarifies that papakāinga will be allowed on general title land where it can be demonstrated that there is a whakapapa or ancestral connection to the land, and the land will remain in Māori ownership; - Council discretion for papakāinga on general title land is restricted to only those matters necessary to determine whether policy PK-Px1 is achieved; - An advice note is added to the rule that requires Council to seek and rely on advice from the relevant iwi authority when determining an application under the rule."  On this basis, I consider that restricted discretionary activity status for papakāinga on general title land is appropriate. I note that this approach is consistent with other District Plans that enable tangata whenua to develop papakāinga on general title land (see Section 32 Evaluation Report, pp.97-100).	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.105.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	District Plan wide – activity status for papakāinga developments	Oppose primary submission	The Standards, Matters of Discretion and Notes appropriately provide for ensuring papakāinga is developed for those who whakapapa or have an ancestral connection to the land. It is appropriate that KCDC seeks advice from iwi authorities on matters related to tikanga Māori. Retain as notified	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.105.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	District Plan wide – activity status for papakāinga developments	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because the rule framework has been developed to ensure that papakāinga are developed by those who have whakapapa or ancestral connections to the specified land. The Standards, Matters of Discretion and Notes appropriately provide for ensuring papakāinga is developed for those who whakapapa or have an ancestral connection to the land. It is appropriate that KCDC seeks advice from iwi authorities on matters related to tikanga Māori.	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.106	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	GRZ – General Residential Zone - Entire chapter	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the use of Residential Intensification Precincts within the existing General Residential Zone. This approach is inconsistent with that otherwise being taken by other councils in the greater Wellington region and does not provide the same degree of transparency with regard to the scale and extent of development that is being enabled by the underlying precincts and as directed by the NPS-UD.  Kāinga Ora seeks the introduction of a distinct zoning framework to give effect more clearly to the intensification policy of the NPS-UD. In particular, Kāinga Ora seeks the introduction of a Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ), which could incorporate a control or precinct to enable additional height and density of urban built form in areas directed by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Kāinga Ora would also support the introduction of a High Density Residential Zone (HRZ) in locations where development of at least 6 storeys is to be enabled, such as land located within proximity to the city centre and/or on the rapid train line in relation to train stations.  Kāinga Ora seeks for all sites that are being proposed to be rezoned as GRZ, instead be rezoned as MRZ (or HRZ where shown as being within the GRZ Residential Precinct A).	1. Delete the General Residential Zone and the Residential Intensification Precincts. Replace with MRZ and HRZ as sought in this submission and appendices. 2. Seek the proposed zone provisions for MRZ and HRZ are <b>accepted</b> , as set out in Appendix 2 and 3 of [the original submission]. 3. The proposed text identifies objectives, policies, rules and standards sought for the MRZ and HRZ, however, do not address all of the existing and proposed overlays (e.g.: Coastal Hazard Precinct). Kāinga Ora would support being included in a finalised version of the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone, subject to the relief and changes sought in this submission. 4. Kāinga Ora seeks the MRZ and HRZ provisions <b>provide for</b> design flexibility and recognise the planned urban built form of the respective residential zones. 5. MRZ is sought to <b>apply</b> across the current notified General Residential Zone spatial extent. Spatial changes to the maps are shown in Appendix 4 [of the original submission]. 6. Seek a height variation control of 18m maximum height is <b>introduced and applied</b> over residential zoned properties proximate to and within 400m walkable catchment of a Local Centre Zone. 7. HRZ is sought to <b>apply</b> across the current notified Residential Intensification Precincts spatial extent. Spatial changes to the maps are shown in Appendix 4 [of the original submission]. 8. Seek a height variation control of 36m maximum height is <b>introduced and applied</b> over residential zoned properties proximate to and within 400m walkable catchment of a Metropolitan Centre Zone.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197.FS.1	S122.106.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ – General Residential Zone - Entire chapter	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	Allow primary submission, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S053.FS.1	S122.106.FS02	Waka Kotahi	GRZ - General Residential Zone - Entire Chapter	Support primary submission	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed rezoning of GRZ to medium density residential to be more consistent with the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S122.106.FS03	Greater Wellington Regional Council	GRZ - General Residential Zone - Entire Chapter	Oppose primary submission	<i>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</i> - increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  <i>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</i> <i>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.106.FS04	Ryman Healthcare Limited	GRZ - General Residential Zone - Entire Chapter	Support primary submission	Ryman supports the relief sought as it is consistent with the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Allow primary submission, subject to the relief sought in the Ryman's primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.106.FS05	Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	GRZ - General Residential Zone - Entire Chapter	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.107	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	269-289 Ngārara Road, Waikanae; 174-211 Ngārara Road, Waikanae; 160-222 Main Road, 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue, Raumati South, Paraparaumu	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers further site specific assessments are required for specific sites to better understand: 1. The need for additional greenfield zoned land beyond the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions; 2. Accessibility to active and public transport, 3. Site constraints, particularly with regard to hazards; 4. Infrastructure requirements; 5. Proximity to Centres and employment opportunities; and  The sites for which Kāinga Ora consider more evidence is required before a decision to rezone can be made are:  1. Proposed greenfield rezoning of 269-289 Ngārara Road, Waikanae (10.18ha) from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone – (150 estimated dwellings); 2. Proposed greenfield rezoning of 174-211 Ngārara Road, Waikanae (19.63ha) from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone – (390 estimated dwellings); 3. Proposed greenfield rezoning of 160-222 Main Road, 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue, Raumati South, Paraparaumu (22.24ha) from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone – (320 estimated dwellings).	1. Kāinga Ora <b>seeks</b> further information and evidence to demonstrate that these sites meet the requirements of a well-functioning urban environment, before a decision to rezone can be made are: i. Proposed greenfield rezoning of 269-289 Ngārara Road, Waikanae (10.18ha) from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone; ii. Proposed greenfield rezoning of 174-211 Ngārara Road, Waikanae (19.63ha) from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone); iii. Proposed greenfield rezoning of 160-222 Main Road, 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue, Raumati South, Paraparaumu (22.24ha) from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone.  2. In reference to 'General Residential Zone' above, Kāinga Ora seeks that MRZ is proposed for these sites if evidence and further information provided demonstrate it is appropriate to be 'live-zoned' and given urban residential zoning. This zoning should be MRZ aligned to this submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Refer to body of report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> By removing 99-105 Poplar Ave from the areas proposed to be rezoned.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.13 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S053.FS.1	S122.107.FS01	Waka Kotahi	269-289 Ngārara Road, Waikanae; 174-211 Ngārara Road, Waikanae; 160-222 Main Road, 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue, Raumati South, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Waka Kotahi supports the proposition that further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S224.FS.3	S122.107.FS02	Simpson, Vanessa and Guy	269-289 Ngārara Road, Waikanae; 174-211 Ngārara Road, Waikanae; 160-222 Main Road, 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue, Raumati South, Paraparaumu	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submission made by Kāinga Ora because the submission fails to recognise that the properties at 205 and 211 Ngārara Road already fall within an urban environment context. The change to a General Residential zone is sensible and logical allowing the properties to be unlocked for development as intended. <i>Reasons for opposition include:</i> - have long been signalled for residential development; - are located between the existing Waikanae township and the Ngārara zoned land to the North; - fall within the Waikanae North Urban Edge in the KCDC Operative District Plan 2021; and - have already been reviewed in terms of their suitability for residential subdivision (including as detailed in the s.32 Evaluation Report Appendix O).  <i>Furthermore, KCDC have already demonstrated the need for additional greenfield land through their own assessments (refer to the KCDC website in relation to housing capacity). The proportionate areas being rezoned into General Residential through PC2 fulfil only a small part of the overall projected need for Kapiti.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.108	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Local Centre Zone. Introduction	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the addition of this explanatory text.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.109	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-P1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment to this policy, but notes that it opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	Retain as notified, subject to District Plan wide removal of design guidelines as appendices to the District Plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted, however I have not recommended removal of the Design Guides as appendices to the District Plan.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.110	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-P3	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this policy.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.111	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-P5	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-P5 as follows: <a href="#">Mixed Use Activities in Centres</a> Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is achieved. <del>in accordance with the principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Principles - Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the S42A report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend LCZ-P5. Refer section 7.4 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the S42A report.
S100.FS.1	S122.111.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-P5	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.111.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-P5	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.111.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-P5	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.112	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this policy for the following reasons: • Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. • Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the Local Centre building height to enable building heights of up to 18 metres (5 storeys). This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Local Centres as being key to accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth in the District, in accordance with their place in the Centres hierarchy.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-P6 as follows: <a href="#">Urban form and design of centres</a> Subdivision, use and development in centres must be undertaken in a manner that achieves efficient integration with necessary infrastructure, reinforces the District's consolidated urban form and sense of place, and provides for a high quality interface between built form and public space. <del>To achieve this, the principles in the Centres Design Principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 will be applied.</del>  <a href="#">A higher density of urban built form will be enabled in the Local Centre Zone including: 1- buildings up to 45 storeys within the Local Centre Zone; or 2- buildings up to 6 storeys within the Local Centre Zone at Paekākāriki.</a>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S098.FS.1	S122.112.FS01	Wiggs, Glen	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the recommendation to amend the Local Centre building height to 18m (5 storeys) in the area marked 'Height Variation Control' at Waikanae Beach. The recommendation does not take into account inundation caused by natural hazards to which the vast majority of the area is subjected to. Many of the properties have been subject to inundation from rainfall from December 2021 to September 2022. The recommendation also does not take into account coastal hazards and in particular Policy 25(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S126.FS.1	S122.112.FS02	Rys, Susan	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the recommendation to amend the Local Centre building height to 18m (5 storeys) in the area marked 'Height Variation Control' at Waikanae Beach. Present day consequence is that the former swamp, river, stream, lakes and low-lying areas are prone to flooding. The proposal to allow buildings 18 metres high would increase the risk of social, environmental and economic harm both to housing and roading caused by inundation. This area is some 4km from Waikanae Town Centre and the Public Transport Hub. at the Railway Station, so has no proximity to a town centre or public transport corridor.  This outcome of the Kainga Ora Proposal 122.112 will lead to: • High density residential building in a flood prone area; • Increase in the impacts of any future requirement for Managed Retreat from sea level rise; • High density residential occupancy in an area with few of the amenities needed to sustain a viable community; • Development that is contra- indicated by KCDC policies and Urban futures documentation; • Overloading of already stressed 3 waters infrastructure; • Removal of the recognised character of the Old Beach area; • Significant decrease in the quality of this coastal suburb; • Lack of services being inadequate for a 5 fold increase in demand; • Significant increase in rates to address service needs in a time of increasing financial hardship and inflation.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S197.FS.1	S122.112.FS03	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Support primary submission in part	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and the RVA's primary submission regarding the inclusion of design guides as a non-statutory tool. The RVA does not otherwise oppose the changes to LCZ-P6 sought by the submitter, subject to the RVA's primary submission point on LCZ-P6 being granted.	Disallow primary submission in relation to the design guides being retained as a guidance tool but otherwise allow primary submission, subject to granting the relief sought in the RVA's submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S225.FS.1	S122.112.FS04	Tate, Karen	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Waikanae Beach is an inappropriate environment for intensification. Support the reasoning provided in S098, S105, and S218. An unintended consequence of allowing buildings of such height is property owners with the financial means building up to get a view. Unlikely that property developers will build affordable houses, favouring luxury apartments. Impacts on the existing community as there are a lack of facilities and not enough space to build them. It makes more sense to build on vacant land with new community facilities (schools, doctors, supermarkets).	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S226.FS.1	S122.112.FS05	Kotrotsos, Androulla	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the recommendation to amend the Local Centre building height to 18m (5 storeys) in the area marked 'Height Variation Control' at Waikanae Beach. The recommendation does not take into account inundation caused by natural hazards to which the vast majority of the area is subjected to. Many of the properties have been subject to inundation from rainfall from December 2021 to September 2022. The recommendation also does not take into account coastal hazards and in particular Policy 25(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010.	Disallow primary submission in part.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S227.FS.1	S122.112.FS06	Tocker, John	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the recommendation to amend the Local Centre building height to 18m (5 storeys) in the area marked 'Height Variation Control' at Waikanae Beach. S122.112 is in excess of the requirements of the RMA-EHS, which includes for residential development up to 3 storeys. The current Local Centre Area comprises only 3 businesses, to remove controls would allow poor quality high density development in a suburban environment. Concerns regarding overlook, privacy, shading etc. The recommendation does not take into account inundation caused by natural hazards to which the vast majority of the area is subjected to. Many of the properties have been subject to inundation from rainfall from December 2021 to September 2022, and the tsunami inundation zone covers almost the whole area of the proposal. The recommendation also does not take into account coastal hazards and in particular Policy 25(b) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010. A 18m 5 storey height limit would be contradictory to KCDC stated policy in that it would: • Deny the consolidated urban form (UFD-P1: 1), which should logically provide for higher densities closer to amenities surrounding the Waikanae railway station and main shopping area • Deny the principle of having medium density housing close to centres (UFD-P1:3a) (as opposed to local centres) • Deny the principle of having medium density close to transport nodes (UFD-P1:3a) • Deny the principle of adverse effects in special character areas, of which Waikanae Beach, and particularly the Olde Beach area have previously been identified and characterised by KCDC endorsed Community vision and action plan for Waikanae Beach 2017(UFD-P1:4) KCDC sponsored Waikanae Beach Futures Documentation includes information that indicates there is a lack of infrastructure to support intensification. S122.112 will lead to: • High density residential building in a flood prone area; • Increase in the impacts of any future requirement for Managed Retreat from sea level rise; • High density residential occupancy in an area with few of the amenities needed to sustain a viable community; • Development that is contradictory to KCDC policies and Urban futures documentation; • Overloading of already stressed 3 waters infrastructure; • Removal of the recognised character of the Old Beach area; • Significant decrease in the quality of this coastal suburb.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S239.FS.1	S122.112.FS07	Galvin, Michelle	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Waikanae Beach already experiences significant flooding events when it rains, and infrastructure is strained. Refer to S098.FS.1 and S227.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S240.FS.1	S122.112.FS08	White, Anne	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	- Flooding is a significant issue in the area and the water table in the district has risen significantly in recent years. - Building on sand has proved to be difficult, building 5 storeys will be even worse. Refer to S098.FS.1 and S227.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.112.FS09	Ryman Healthcare Limited	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Support primary submission in part	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the NPSUD and Ryman's primary submission regarding the inclusion of design guides as a non-statutory tool. Ryman does not otherwise oppose the changes to LCZ-P6 sought by the submitter, subject to Ryman's primary submission point on LCZ-P6 being granted.	Disallow the submission point in relation to the design guides being retained as a guidance tool but otherwise allow submission point, subject to granting the relief sought in Ryman's submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.112.FS10	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.112.FS11	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.112.FS12	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.112.FS13	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.112.FS14	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-P6 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.113	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-Px1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the addition of this explanatory text.	Retain LCZ-Px1 as notified other than amend the title of the precinct.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted, although as outlined in my assessment of S122.16, I do not consider it appropriate to amend the title of the precinct.	Accept in part. Noting that I do not recommend amending the title of the precinct.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.114	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-R6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this rule but seeks amendments to Standards in this rule to provide for greater design flexibility and to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules for the residential zones.	Amend the standards under rule LCZ-R6 as follows: <u>Height</u> <u>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 12-18 metres in height, except and within the Coastal Hazard Overlay Qualifying Matter Precinct, no building shall be more than 3 storeys above the original ground level.</u> <u>Measurement criteria:</u> <u>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</u> <u>Height in relation to boundary</u> <u>2. Buildings and structures must not project beyond a: 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown on the following diagram:</u> <u>a) For boundaries with the High Density Residential Zone:</u> <u>i. 60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 20m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</u> <u>ii. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> <u>b) For all other zones, a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.114.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.114.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.114.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.115	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-R6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the minimum requirement of 8m² of outdoor living space per unit located above ground floor level (with a minimum dimension of 1.8m); however, asks that this standard applies only to units with two bedrooms or more. It is considered that for studio and one-bedroom units a minimum requirement of 5m² may be an appropriate standard for outdoor living space requirements. Further to this, Kāinga Ora also seeks the dispensation of the need for balconies meeting the minimum dimensions specified in the MDRS for a proportion of units.	Amend the standards under rule LCZ-R6 as follows: ... <u>Outdoor living space (per residential unit, as measured by the Residential Unit Measurement Criteria)</u> <u>3. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 square metres and that comprises ground floor, balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that:</u> <u>a. where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 metres, and</u> <u>b. where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; and</u> <u>c. is accessible from the residential unit; and</u> <u>d. may be:</u> <u>i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location; or</u> <u>ii. located directly adjacent to the unit; and</u> <u>e. is free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas.</u> <u>4. A residential unit containing more than 2 bedrooms located above ground floor level must have an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace that:</u> <u>a. is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; and</u> <u>b. is accessible from the residential unit; and</u> <u>c. may be:</u> <u>i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location, in which case it may be located at ground level; or</u> <u>ii. located directly adjacent to the unit.</u> ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.115.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.115.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.115.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.116	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-R12	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this rule for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the Local Centre building height to enable building heights of up to 5 storeys or 18 metres. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Local Centres as being key to accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth in the District, in accordance with their place in the Centres hierarchy.</li> <li>• This rule should be subject to a non-notification clause for Standards 4 to 12, 14 and 15 under LCZ-Rule R6. Breaches to these standards are design/public realm matters, and not a matter in which notification of the general public or neighbours would be warranted.</li> <li>• This rule should be subject to an exclusion from public notification clause for Standards 2, 3 and 13. Breaches of these standards are limited to adjacent properties, and are not a matter in which notification of the general public would be warranted.</li> <li>• Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multi-unit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule TCZ-R11 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.</li> </ul>	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks the LCZ provisions provide for design flexibility and recognise the planned urban built form of the zone. <b>Amend</b> LCZ-R12 as follows:</p> <p><b>New buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings in the Local Centre Zone (except in Paekākāriki) where one or more of the following permitted activity standards is not met:</b></p> <p><b>Excludes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New minor buildings and additions and alterations to existing minor buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Measurement criteria apply to activities under this rule.</b></p> <p><b>Notification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <b>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with:</b></li> <li>• LCZ-R6 Standards 4 to 12, 14 and 15 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</li> <li>ii. <b>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with:</b></li> <li>• LCZ-R6 Standards 2, 3 and 13 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</li> </ul> <p><b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b></p> <p><b>Standards</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For active retail frontages the distance between pedestrian entrances must not exceed 18 metres.</li> <li>2. Buildings and structures must not exceed 4618 metres in height, except that</li> <li>3. Buildings and structures within the Local Centre Zone at Paekākāriki must not exceed 21 metres in height.</li> </ol> <p><b>Measurement criteria:</b></p> <p>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</p> <p><b>Matters of Discretion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development.</li> <li>2. Consideration of the standard(s) not met.</li> <li>3. Visual, character, amenity, historic heritage, streetscape and stream effects.</li> <li>4. The extent of consistency with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x.2 and the Land Development Minimum Requirements</li> <li>5. Effects on landform and landscape.</li> </ol> <p>...</p>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend LCZ-R12 (refer to section 7.8 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S122.116.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments.</li> <li>- Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>- Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential</li> <li>- Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential</li> </ul> <p>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</p> <p>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.116.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.116.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.116.FS04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kapiti district.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.116.FS05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.116.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.116.FS07	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.116.FS08	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	LCZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	<p>Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.117	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	LCZ-R20	Support	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendment to this rule, noting that it is a temporary measure until a future plan change.</p>	Retain as notified	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.118	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P1	Support	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this policy.</p>	Retain as notified	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.119	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P4	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.120	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	Amend MUZ-P6 as follows: <u>Mixed Use Activities in Centres</u> Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is achieved. <del>in accordance with the principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Principles - Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the S42A report for details.	Yes. Amend MUZ-P6. Refer section 8.3 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the S42A report.
S122	S122.121	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.  Kāinga Ora supports a general height limit of up to 6 storeys in the Zone – at 22m, not 21m.	Kāinga Ora seeks the MUZ provisions provide for design flexibility and recognise the planned urban built form of the zone. Amend MUZ-P7 as follows: <u>Urban form and design of centres</u> Subdivision, use and development in centres must be undertaken in a manner that achieves efficient integration with necessary infrastructure, reinforces the District's consolidated urban form and sense of place, and provides for a high quality interface between built form and public space. <del>To achieve this, the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 will be applied.</del>  <u>A higher density of urban built form will be enabled in the Mixed Use Zone including:</u> 1. buildings up to 6-storeys; 2. buildings up to 6-storeys within the Ihakara Street West, Ihakara Street East and Kapiti Road precincts of the Mixed Use Zone; or 3. buildings up to 3-storeys within the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct of the Mixed Use Zone.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.121.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.121.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.121.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.121.FS04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.121.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.121.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-P7 Urban form and design of centres	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.122	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but seeks amendments to Standards in this rule to provide for greater design flexibility and to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules for the residential zones.  Kāinga Ora supports the minimum requirement of 8m <sup>2</sup> of outdoor living space per unit located above ground floor level (with a minimum dimension of 1.8m); however, asks that this standard applies only to units with two bedrooms or more. It is considered that for studio and one-bedroom units a minimum requirement of 5m <sup>2</sup> may be an appropriate standard for outdoor living space requirements. Further to this, Kāinga Ora also seeks the dispensation of the need for balconies meeting the minimum dimensions specified in the MDRS for a proportion of units.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R6 as follows: <b>Standards</b> <b>Height</b> <u>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 42.22 metres in height, except for:</u> <u>i. buildings and structures within the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct of the Mixed Use Zone, must not exceed 12 metres in height.</u> <b>Measurement criteria:</b> <u>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</u> <b>Height in relation to boundary</b> <u>2. Buildings and structures must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown on the following diagram:</u> <u>a) For boundaries with the High Density Residential Zone:</u> <u>i. 60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 20m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</u> <u>ii. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> <u>b) For all other zones, a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> <u>Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way.</u> ... <u>4. A residential unit containing more than 2 bedrooms located above ground floor level must have an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace that:</u> ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S122.122.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.122.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.122.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.122.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.123	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R9	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R9 as follows: <b>New buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures in the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct.....</b> ..... <b>Matters of Control</b> 1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development. 2. The extent of consistency with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Guidelines in Appendix 6, Council's <u>Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2042 Land Development Minimum Requirements</u> and the <u>Centres Design Principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2</u> . 3. Visual, character and amenity effects. 4. Context and surroundings. 5. Cumulative effects. 6. The imposition of financial contributions in accordance with the Financial Contributions chapter.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.123.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-R9	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.123.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-R9	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.123.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R9	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.124	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R11	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	<b>Amend MUZ-R11 as follows:</b> Retail activities in the Paraparaumu North Gateway Precinct that do not meet the permitted activity standards. Restricted Discretionary Activity..... Matters of Discretion 1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development. 2. The extent of consistency with the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Guidelines in Appendix 6, Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements, 2012 Land Development Minimum Requirements and the Centres Design Guide in Appendix 20 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2. 3. Economic effects including effects on the vitality of centres. 4. Visual, character and amenity effects. 5. Traffic and transport effects. 6. Location and design of parking, traffic circulation areas, loading and access. 7. Context and surroundings. 8. Cumulative effects. 9. Whether any nuisance effects are created. 10. The consistency with the relevant objectives and policies.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.124.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.124.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.124.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.125	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	<b>Amend MUZ-R12 as follows:</b> Development which is undertaken in accordance with the Development Incentives Guidelines set out in Appendix 1..... .....Matters of Discretion 1. The scale of biodiversity, energy or water quality benefits created by the proposal. 2. Layout, size, design and location of proposed buildings (excluding minor buildings). 3. Visual, character and amenity effects. 4. Ecological or biodiversity effects. 5. Traffic and transport effects. 6. Proposed mitigation, remediation or ongoing management measures. 7. Effect on natural character values. 8. Cumulative effects. <del>9. The Centres Design Principles in Appendix 1 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.125.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.125.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.125.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.125.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R12	Oppose primary submission	Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.126	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MUZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this rule for the following reasons: • Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the Mixed Use building height to enable building heights of up to 6 storeys or 22 metres. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Town Centres as being key to accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth in the District, in accordance with their place in the Centres hierarchy. • This rule should be subject to a non-notification clause for Standards 3 to 9 under MUZ-Rule R6. Breaches to these standards are design/public realm matters, and not a matter in which notification of the general public or neighbours would be warranted. • This rule should be subject to an exclusion from public notification clause for Standards 2 and 10. Breaches of these standards are limited to adjacent properties, and are not a matter in which notification of the general public would be warranted. • Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multi-unit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule TCZ-R11 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	<b>Amend MUZ-R13 as follows:</b> New buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures where one or more of the permitted activity standards in MUZ-R6 is not met. Excludes: • New minor buildings and additions and alterations to existing minor buildings. Measurement criteria apply to activities under this rule. Notification i. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with: • MUZ-R6 Standards 3 to 9 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA. ii. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with: • MUZ-R6 Standards 2 and 10 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.  Restricted Discretionary Activity  Standards Height 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 24.22 metres in height. Measurement criteria: Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.  Matters of Discretion 1. Location, layout, size and design of proposed development. 2. Consideration of the permitted activity standard not met. 3. Visual, character, amenity, historic heritage, streetscape and stream effects. 4. The extent of consistency with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Guidelines in Appendix 6, Council's Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 and the Land Development Minimum Requirements Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements 2012 and the Centres Design Principles in Appendix 20. 5. Effects on landform and landscape. ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend MUZ-R13 (refer to section 8.9 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S122.126.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.126.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.126.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district. Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.126.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.126.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MUZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.127	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	Town Centre Zone: Introduction	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the addition of this explanatory text.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.128	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ- P3	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this policy.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.129	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-P5	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	Amend TCZ-P5 as follows: <a href="#">Mixed Use Activities in Centres</a> Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is achieved. in accordance with the <a href="#">Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2</a> .	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the S42A report for details.	Yes. Amend TCZ-P5. Refer section 6.3 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the S42A report.
S100.FS.1	S122.129.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-P5	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.129.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	TCZ-P5	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.129.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-P5	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.130	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-P6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	Amend TCZ-P6 as follows: <a href="#">Urban form and design of centres</a> Subdivision, use and development in centres must be undertaken in a manner that achieves efficient integration with necessary infrastructure, reinforces the District's consolidated urban form and sense of place, and provides for a high quality interface between built form and public space. To achieve this, the principles in the <a href="#">Centres Design Principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2</a> will be applied.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.130.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.130.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	TCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.130.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.131	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-Px1	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed policy, but seeks that this policy is reworded consistent with this submission.	Amend TCZ-Px1 as follows: Rename the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct as the Coastal Hazard Precinct.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Support is noted, although as outlined in my assessment of S122.16, I do not consider it appropriate to amend the title of the precinct.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.132	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-Px2	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed policy.	Retain as notified.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.133	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-R6	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but seek amendments to Standards in this rule to provide for greater design flexibility and to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules for the residential zones.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the Town Centre building height to enable building heights of up to 22 metres (6 storeys). This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Town Centres as being key to accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth in the District, in accordance with their place in the Centres hierarchy.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the minimum requirement of 8m<sup>2</sup> of outdoor living space per unit located above ground floor level (with a minimum dimension of 1.8m); however, asks that this standard applies only to units with two bedrooms or more. It is considered that for studio and one-bedroom units a minimum requirement of 5m<sup>2</sup> may be an appropriate standard for outdoor living space requirements. Further to this, Kāinga Ora also seeks the dispensation of the need for balconies meeting the minimum dimensions specified in the MDRS for a proportion of units.</p>	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks the TCZ provisions provide for design flexibility and recognise the planned urban built form of the zone. <b>Amend</b> TCZ-R6 as follows:</p> <p><b>Standards</b>  <b>Height</b>  <b>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 12 22 metres in height, except for buildings and structures, and within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and the Marae Takiwā Precinct no building shall be more than 3 storeys (12 metres) in height above the original ground level.</b>  <b>Measurement criteria:</b>  <b>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</b>  <b>Height in relation to boundary</b>  <b>2. Buildings and structures must not project beyond</b>  <b>a. 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown on the following diagram.</b>  <b>a) For boundaries with the High Density Residential Zone:</b>  <b>i. 60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 20m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</b>  <b>ii. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</b>  <b>b) For all other zones, a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</b>                  ...  <b>4.A residential unit containing more than 2 bedrooms located above ground floor level must have an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace that:</b>  <b>a. is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; and</b>  <b>b. is accessible from the residential unit; and</b>  <b>c. may be:</b>  <b>i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location, in which case it may be located at ground level; or</b>  <b>ii. located directly adjacent to the unit.</b>                  ...</p>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.133.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<p>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments.</li> <li>- Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>- Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential</li> <li>- Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential</li> </ul> <p>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</p> <p>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.133.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<p>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.133.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	TCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<p>Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.133.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<p>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.134	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-R7	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendment to this rule.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.135	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-Rx1	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the introduction of this rule.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.136	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-R10	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule TCZ-R10 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	<b>Amend TCZ-R10 as follows:</b> Retail activities that do not comply with one or more of the permitted activity standards.  Restricted Discretionary Activity  <b>Standards</b> 1. Retail activities in the following zones shall have a ground level retail floor space less than: a. 1000m2 in the Raumati Beach Town Centre Zone; b. 1000m2 in the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone; c. 2000m2 in the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone. 2. Supermarkets in the Waikanae Town Centre Zone and Ōtaki Rail Town Centre Zone.  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development. 2. Consideration of the standard(s) not met. 3. The extent of consistency with the <a href="#">Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 and the Land Development Minimum Requirements</a> . 4. Visual, character, amenity and streetscape effects. 5. Traffic and transport effects. 6. Location and design of parking, traffic circulation areas, loading and access. 7. Public safety. 8. Context and surroundings. 9. Cumulative effects. 10. Whether any nuisance effects are created. 11. The consistency with the relevant objectives and policies. 12. Economic effects including effects on the vitality of centres.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.136.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R10	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.136.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangitira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangitira	TCZ-R10	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.136.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-R10	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.137	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-R11	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this rule for the following reasons: • Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the Town Centre building height to enable building heights of up to 6 storeys. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Town Centres as being key to accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth in the District, in accordance with their place in the Centres hierarchy. • This rule should be subject to a non-notification clause for Standards 4 to 15 under TCZ-Rule R6. Breaches to these standards are design/public realm matters, and not a matter in which notification of the general public or neighbours would be warranted. • This rule should be subject to an exclusion from public notification clause for Standards 2 and 3. Breaches of these standards are limited to adjacent properties, and are not a matter in which notification of the general public would be warranted. • Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multi-unit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule TCZ-R11 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	<b>Amend TCZ-R11 as follows:</b> New buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures where one or more of the permitted activity standards is not met. Excludes: • Papakāinga (refer rule TCZ-Rx3) • Buildings and structures within the Marae Takiwā Precinct (refer rule TCZ-Rx4) • New minor buildings and additions and alterations to existing minor buildings. Height measurement criteria apply to activities under this rule. <b>Notification</b> i. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with: • TCZ-R6 Standards 4 to 15 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA. ii. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with: • TCZ-R6 Standards 2 and 3 is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.  Restricted Discretionary Activity  <b>Standards</b> 1. For active retail frontages the distance between pedestrian entrances must not exceed 18 metres. Height 2. Buildings and structures must not exceed 42.22 metres in height. Measurement criteria: Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development. 2. Consideration of the standard(s) not met. 3. Visual, character, amenity, historic heritage, streetscape and stream effects. 4. The extent of consistency with the <a href="#">Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 and the Land Development Minimum Requirements</a> . 5. Effects on landform and landscape. ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend TCZ-R11 (refer to section 6.11 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S122.137.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.137.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161.FS.1	S122.137.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.137.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.137.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-R11	Oppose primary submission	Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.138	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule TCZ-R13 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-R13 as follows: Development which is undertaken in accordance with the Development Incentives Guidelines set out in Appendix 1.  Restricted Discretionary Activity  <b>Standards</b> 1. The amount of development proposed must not exceed or proceed earlier than the stipulations in the guideline.  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. The scale of biodiversity, energy or water quality benefits created by the proposal. 2. Layout, size, design and location of proposed buildings (excluding minor buildings). 3. Visual, character and amenity effects. 4. Ecological or biodiversity effects. 5. Traffic and transport effects. 6. Proposed mitigation, remediation or ongoing management measures. 7. Effect on natural character values. 8. Cumulative effects. <del>9. The Centres Design Principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.138.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	TCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.138.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	TCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.138.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.139	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-Rx2	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.140	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-Rx3	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that I recommend amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting recommendations to amend this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.141	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	TCZ-Rx4	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed rule, subject to the amendments sought to TCZ-R11	Retain TCZ-Rx4 as notified, subject to the requested amendments to TCZ-R11	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Support is noted. I note that I do not recommend amendments to rule TCZ-R11 under submission point 122.137.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have not recommended amendments to TCZ-R11 under submission point S122.137.	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.142	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-P2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments for the following reasons: • Kāinga Ora seeks greater certainty should be provided through the use of the term 'high density'. • Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-P2 as follows: Subdivision, use and development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone will be undertaken in accordance with the Metropolitan Centre Zone Structure Plan in Appendix 19 and the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2, in a manner that reinforces the following specific management principles for each precinct: ... Precinct C will be developed in the following manner: a. transport circulation and integration within the surrounding Metropolitan Centre precincts will be provided for; b. adverse effects that would otherwise decrease the efficiency and effectiveness of Kāpiti Road as a transport corridor, including for public transport, will be managed; c. amenity values of Kāpiti Road will be maintained or enhanced; d. adverse effects on the landscape and amenity values of the dune system will be avoided to the extent practicable having regard to the development outcomes provided for in Precinct C and, where adverse effects cannot be avoided, they will be mitigated or offset by environmental enhancements within Precinct C that are commensurate with the scale of the adverse effects. e. the establishment of complementary activities, including commercial and residential activities (excluding industrial and retail activities), will be provided for where activities remain compatible with the role and function of Precinct A as the primary retail and commercial core of the Metropolitan Centre Zone; f. allowance for retail activities will be limited in type and scale, to ensure adverse effects on the vitality and viability of the Metropolitan Centre will not be significant; g. medium-density higher-density residential activities will be enabled in conjunction with commercial activities(excluding industrial and retail activities); and h. stormwater management will be provided to address stormwater concerns and, where practicable, will also support ecological and recreational values.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the S42A report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend MCZ-P2. Refer section 5.1 of PC(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the S42A report.
S100.FS.1	S122.142.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-P2	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.142.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-P2	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.142.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P2	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.143	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-P5	Support	Kāinga Ora support the proposed amendments to this policy.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S122	S122.144	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-P7	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-P7 as follows: <i>Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is achieved, in accordance with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</i>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the S42A report for details.	Yes. Amend MCZ-P7. Refer section 5.3 of PC(R1). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the S42A report.
S100.FS.1	S122.144.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-P7	Oppose primary submission	<i>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.144.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-P7	Oppose primary submission	<i>Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.144.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P7	Oppose primary submission	<i>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.145	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-P8	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this policy for the following reasons: • Kāinga Ora opposes any policy approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. • Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the Metropolitan Centre building height to enable building heights of up to 15 storeys or 53 metres. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Metropolitan Centres as significant sub-regional centres second only to the City Centre in the Centres hierarchy.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-P8 as follows: <i>Subdivision, use and development in centres must be undertaken in a manner that achieves efficient integration with necessary infrastructure, reinforces the District's consolidated urban form and sense of place, and provides for a high quality interface between built form and public space. To achieve this, the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 will be applied.</i>  <i>A higher density of urban built form will be enabled in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, including buildings up to 12-15 storeys or 53 metres.</i>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S122.145.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	<i>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.145.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	<i>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.145.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	<i>Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district. Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.145.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	<i>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.145.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P8	Oppose primary submission	<i>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.146	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R5	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but: • Seeks amendments to Standards referenced in this rule • Seeks the deletion of Standards 2b and 2c to enable greater design flexibility.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-R5 as follows: <b>Standards</b> 1. Where residential activities(excluding visitor accommodation that is not temporary residential rental accommodation) are incorporated into a development that includes commercial activities they must be located above ground floor level or separated from all street frontages by commercial activities. 2. Residential activities (other than those incorporated into a development that includes retail or commercial activities) must meet the following standards (excluding visitor accommodation that is not temporary residential rental accommodation): a. comprise at least one residential unit (as measured by the residential unit measurement criteria); <b>b. a ground-floor habitable room must face the street in any residential building that fronts the street;</b> <b>c. residential buildings that front a street must have a main pedestrian front door accessed from the street;</b> d. garages, irrespective of access, must be recessed a minimum 1.0 metre behind the front façade of a residential buildings (irrespective of whether the front façade fronts a street, a common lane, a rear boundary, etc.); <b>e. the maximum height (above original ground level) of a front boundary fence, or any fence within the front yard, shall be 0.8 metres;</b> f. building coverage must not exceed 50%. Measurement Criteria a. When measuring building coverage, include: i. any part of the site subject to a designation that may be taken or acquired under the Public Works Act 1981. b. When measuring building coverage, exclude: i. any section of any buildings that extends out beyond the ground floor level limits of the building and overhangs the ground. ii. The footprint of any minor Building 3. Compliance with FC-Table 1.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider these standards to be inconsistent with the requirement to give effect to Policy 3(b) of the NPS-UD in the Metropolitan Centre Zone. Policy 3(b) requires the District Plan to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, but it does not preclude consideration of the matters outlined in the standards sought to be removed by the submitter. I do not consider there to be sufficient justification to remove the standards.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.146.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-R5	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.146.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-R5	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.146.FS03	Nga Hapu o Ōtaki	MCZ-R5	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.147	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R7	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but: • Seeks amendments to Standards referenced in this rule including height • Amendments to Standard 2 (Height in relation to boundary) as needed to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules for the residential zones.	<b>Amend</b> the standards under rule MCZ-R7 as follows: <b>Standards</b> <b>Height</b> <b>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 21.53 metres in height.</b> <b>Measurement criteria:</b> <b>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</b> <b>Height in relation to boundary</b> <b>2. Buildings and structures must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown on the following diagram</b> <b>a) For boundaries with the High Density Residential Zone:</b> <b>i. 60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 22m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</b> <b>ii. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</b> <b>b) For all other zones, a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</b> <b>Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way.</b> <b>This standard does not apply to any of the following:</b> <b>a. a boundary with a road;</b> <b>b. a boundary between a site in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, and a site in any of the following zones:</b> <b>i. Any centres zone;</b> <b>ii. The Mixed Use Zone;</b> <b>iii. The General Industrial Zone;</b> <b>c. Residential chimneys, electricity transmission towers, masts, radio, television and telecommunication antenna and aerials.</b> ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S122.147.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S122.147.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.147.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.147.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.148	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R7	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this rule but: • Kāinga Ora supports the minimum requirement of 8m <sup>2</sup> of outdoor living space per unit located above ground floor level (with a minimum dimension of 1.8m); however, asks that this standard applies only to units with two bedrooms or more. It is considered that for studio and one bedroom units a minimum requirement of 5m <sup>2</sup> may be an appropriate standard for outdoor living space requirements. Further to this, Kāinga Ora also seeks the dispensation of the need for balconies meeting the minimum dimensions specified in the MDRS for a proportion of units.	<b>Amend</b> the standards under rule MCZ-R7 as follows: <u>Standards</u> ... <u>Outdoor living space (per residential unit, as measured by the Residential Unit Measurement Criteria)</u> <u>3. Except as provided for under Rule MCZ-R3, a residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 square metres and that comprises ground floor, balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that:</u> <u>a. where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 metres; and</u> <u>b. where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; and</u> <u>c. is accessible from the residential unit; and</u> <u>d. may be:</u> <u>a. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location; or</u> <u>b. located directly adjacent to the unit; and</u> <u>e. is free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing and manoeuvring areas.</u> <u>4. A residential unit containing more than 2 bedrooms located above ground floor level must have an outdoor living space in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace that:</u> <u>a. is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; and</u> <u>b. is accessible from the residential unit; and</u> <u>c. may be:</u> <u>i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location, in which case it may be located at ground level; or</u> <u>ii. located directly adjacent to the unit.</u> ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.148.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.148.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.148.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R7	Oppose primary submission	The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.149	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R11	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this rule.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.150	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R13	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this rule for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Metropolitan Centre building height controls (Standard 2) should enable building heights of up to 15 storeys or 53 metres. This change will enable greater development capacity and is appropriate given the identification of the Metropolitan Centres as significant sub-regional centres second only to the City Centre in the Centres hierarchy.</li> <li>This rule should be subject to a non-notification clause for Standards 3 to 15 and Standards 19 to 20 under MCZ Rule R7 and all Standards under MCZ Rule R11. Breaches to these standards are design/public realm matters, and not a matter in which notification of the general public or neighbours would be warranted.</li> <li>This rule should be subject to an exclusion from public notification clause for Standards 2 and 13. Breaches of these standards are limited to adjacent properties, and are not a matter in which notification of the general public would be warranted.</li> <li>Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multi-unit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule MCZ-R13 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.</li> </ul>	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks the MCZ provisions provide for design flexibility and recognise the planned urban built form of the zone. <b>Amend</b> MCZ-R13 as follows:</p> <p><b>New buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures where one or more of the permitted activity standards in MCZ-R7 or one or more of the controlled activity standards in MCZ-R11 are not met.</b></p> <p><b>Excludes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New minor buildings and additions and alterations to existing minor buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Measurement criteria apply to activities under this rule.</b></p> <p><b>Notification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCZ-R7 Standards 3 to 15 and Standards 19 to 20; or</li> <li>MCZ-R11 Standards 1 to 2;</li> </ul> </li> <li>An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCZ-R7 Standards 2 and 13</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</b></p> <p><b>ii. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MCZ-R7 Standards 2 and 13</li> </ul> <p><b>is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA</b></p> <p><b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b></p> <p><b>Standards</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For active retail frontages in Precinct A, the distance between pedestrian entrances must not exceed 18 metres.</li> </ol> <p><b>Height</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings and structures must not exceed 49.53 metres in height.</li> </ol> <p><b>Measurement criteria:</b></p> <p>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</p> <p><b>Matters of Discretion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development.</li> <li>Consideration of the standard(s) not met.</li> <li>Visual, character, amenity, historic heritage and streetscape effects.</li> <li>The extent of consistency with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 and the Land Development Minimum Requirements</li> <li>Effects on landform and landscape.</li> </ol> <p>...</p>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend MCZ-R13 (refer to section 5.8 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S122.150.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments.</li> <li>Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential</li> <li>Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential</li> </ul> <p>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</p> <p>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.150.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</p> <p>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.150.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.150.FS04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.150.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.150.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.150.FS07	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R13	Oppose primary submission	<p>Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.151	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multiunit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule MCZ-R14 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-R14 as follows: Large Format retail activities in Precinct C that are not permitted by MCZ-R10. ... Matters of Discretion 1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development. 2. The extent of consistency with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Guidelines in Appendix 6 - Council's Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 and the Land Development Minimum Requirements. 3. Visual, character, amenity, historic heritage and streetscape effects. 4. Traffic and transport effects. 5. Location and design of parking, traffic circulation areas, loading and access. 6. Public safety. 7. Context and surroundings. 8. Whether any nuisance effects are created. 9. The consistency with the relevant objectives and policies. 10. Effects on the vitality and viability of the Metropolitan Centre Zone	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S122.151.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-R14	Support primary submission in part	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (inclusion of design outcomes in matters of discretion and objectives and policies) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow primary submission regarding removal of Design Guidelines in full, but otherwise disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.151.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	MCZ-R14	Support primary submission in part	Ryman supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (inclusion of design outcomes in matters of discretion and objectives and policies) as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow primary submission regarding removal of Design Guidelines in full, but otherwise disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.151.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	MCZ-R14	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.151.FS04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	MCZ-R14	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.151.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-R14	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.152	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	MCZ-R15	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this rule.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.153	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FUZ-P10	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this policy.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.153.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FUZ-P10	Support primary submission	Ātiawa seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.153.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FUZ-P10	Support primary submission	NHoO seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.154	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FUZ-R6	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed rule.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.154.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FUZ-R6	Support primary submission	Ātiawa seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.154.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FUZ-R6	Support primary submission	NHoO seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.155	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FUZ-Rx1	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed rule and preclusion from public notification.	<b>Retain</b> as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S122.155.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FUZ-Rx1	Support primary submission	Ātiawa seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.155.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FUZ-Rx1	Support primary submission	NHoO seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.156	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FUZ-Rx2	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed rule and preclusion from public notification.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that I recommend amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations to amend this provision in response to other submissions.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.156.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FUZ-Rx2	Support primary submission	Ātiawa seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.156.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FUZ-Rx2	Support primary submission	NHoO seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.157	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FUZ-R14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment to this rule.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.157.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FUZ-R14	Support primary submission	Ātiawa seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.157.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FUZ-R14	Support primary submission	NHoO seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.158	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	FUZ-R15	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendment to this rule.	Retain as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S100.FS.1	S122.158.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	FUZ-R15	Support primary submission	Ātiawa seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.158.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FUZ-R15	Support primary submission	NHoO seeks amendments to these matters as detailed in our primary submission: The purpose of the Papakāinga Chapter is to assist tangata whenua in the development and use of papakāinga on their ancestral land. It recognises that papakāinga development provides a pathway to sustain the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua. It also acknowledges the barriers tangata whenua face to developing and using their land in the way that fits into the principle of tino rangatiratanga, and that these barriers can be linked to the process of land alienation. Given the limited land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 and the limited general title land of sufficient size available for papakāinga development, this development should not be limited by the effects of existing adjacent development. Remove cumulative effects from the matters of discretion.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S122	S122.159	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	HOSZ-R6	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to this rule but seeks amendments to Standards in this rule to provide for greater design flexibility and to achieve consistency with any recommended changes to the height in relation to boundary rules for the residential zones.	<b>Amend</b> HOSZ-R6 as follows: <b>Standards</b> <b>Height</b> <u>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 22 metres in height.</u> <b>Measurement criteria:</b> <u>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</u> <b>Height in relation to boundary</b> <u>2. Buildings and structures must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown on the following diagram:</u> <b>a) For boundaries with the High Density Residential Zone:</b> <u>i. 60° recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the first 22m of the side boundary as measured from the road frontage;</u> <u>ii. 60° recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries;</u> <b>b) For all other zones, a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4m vertically above ground level along all other boundaries; <u>Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way.</u> ...</b>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S122.159.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	HOSZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<i>Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including:</i> <i>- Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments.</i> <i>- Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</i> <i>- Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential</i> <i>- Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential</i>  <i>Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12.</i> <i>Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.159.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	HOSZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<i>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.159.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	HOSZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<i>Oppose the submitters request to increase development capacity, it is inappropriate for further intensification to take place. Further intensification and increased height controls further intensify the impacts of development on the environment, wellbeing and cultural values. Development needs to be in accordance with cultural values and have minimal impact on te taiao. It is also unclear how this level of intensified development would be managed in order to avoid adverse effects on the natural environment. The current capacity proposed in the plan change seems sufficient for the housing needs in Kāpiti and it is unclear how further intensification is necessary.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.159.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	HOSZ-R6	Oppose primary submission	<i>The proposed intensification under PC2 provides sufficient capacity for the projected need. Enabling further capacity is provided for through future growth area provisions and increased density can be applied for through a resource consent where the effects can be assessed. Design outcomes, including the provision of outdoor living space is critical to the wellbeing of residents.</i>	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.160	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	HOSZ-R8	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to this rule for the following reasons: • For consistency with other zones, this rule should be subject to a non-notification clause for Standards 3 to 5 and 7 under HOSZ-Rule R6. Breaches to these standards are design/public realm matters, and not a matter in which notification of the general public or neighbours would be warranted. • This rule should be subject to an exclusion from public notification clause for Standards 2 and 6 of Rule HOSZ-R6. Breaches of these standards are limited to adjacent properties, and are not a matter in which notification of the general public would be warranted. • Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multi-unit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule HOSZ-R8 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	<b>Amend</b> HOSZ-R8 as follows: <b>New buildings and structures and additions and alterations to existing buildings and structures where no more than one or more of the following permitted activity standards is are not met:</b> <b>Excludes:</b> • <b>New minor buildings and additions and alterations to existing minor buildings.</b> <b>Measurement criteria apply to activities under this rule.</b> <b>Notification</b> <u>i. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with:</u> • <u>MCZ-R7 Standards 3 to 5 and 7;</u> <u>is precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.</u> <u>ii. An application under this rule where compliance is not achieved with:</u> • <u>MCZ-R7 Standards 2 and 6</u> <u>is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA</u>  <b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b>  <b>Standards</b> <b>Height</b> <u>1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 24.22 metres in height.</u> <b>Measurement criteria:</b> <u>Height must be measured using the height measurement criteria.</u>  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. Location, layout, size and design of the proposed development. 2. Consideration of the standard(s) not met. 3. Visual, character, amenity, historic heritage, streetscape and stream effects. 4. The extent of consistency with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Guidelines in Appendix 6, Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements and the Centres-Design-Guide in Appendix x2. 5. Effects on landform and landscape. ...	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend HOSZ-R8 (refer to section 9.2 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S122.160.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	HOSZ-R8	Oppose primary submission	Kāinga Ora seek a number of amendment to provide for greater development capacity, including: - Increasing the proposed maximum height limits in Metropolitan Centre, Town Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use zones with additional higher limits within walkable catchments. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. - Rezoning the spatial extent and properties subject to the Residential Intensification Precincts to High Density Residential - Rezoning properties within 400m of a Local Centre Zone as Medium Density Residential  Greater Wellington opposes 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 and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, in particular Objective 12. Greater Wellington seek that additional provisions are included to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.160.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	HOSZ-R8	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission. Ātiawa seeks to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Ātiawa has valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.160.FS03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	HOSZ-R8	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.160.FS04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	HOSZ-R8	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.160.FS05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	HOSZ-R8	Oppose primary submission	Mana whenua have an important kaitiaki role in the area and therefore seek to retain the ability to submit on subdivision proposals. Mana whenua have valuable mātauranga to contribute to this process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.161	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	HOSZ-R9	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with. Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan. Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports the design guidelines for multi-unit development and residential development in Centres sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment, which is addressed in the matters of discretion under Rule HOSZ-R8 and further articulated in the relevant objectives and policies.	Amend HOSZ-R9 as follows: <a href="#">Development which is undertaken in accordance with the Development Incentives Guidelines set out in Appendix 1.</a>  <a href="#">Restricted Discretionary Activity</a>  <b>Standards</b> 1. The amount of development proposed must not exceed or proceed earlier than the stipulations in the guideline.  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. The scale of biodiversity, energy or water quality benefits created by the proposal. 2. Layout, size, design and location of proposed buildings (excluding minor buildings). 3. Visual, character and amenity effects. 4. Ecological or biodiversity effects. 5. Traffic and transport effects. 6. Proposed mitigation, remediation or ongoing management measures. 7. Effect on natural character values. 8. Cumulative effects. <del>9. The Centres Design Principles in Appendix 20 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</del>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S122.161.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	HOSZ-R9	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.161.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	HOSZ-R9	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.161.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	HOSZ-R9	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.162	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	HOSZ-R14	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to this rule.	Retain as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S122	S122.163	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with.  Kāinga Ora 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 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.  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.	1. Kāinga Ora 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: <b>Note:</b> <a href="#">1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</a> 2. Delete all references to the Design Guidelines. 3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment. 4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development. 5. If the relief sought in this submission point is not granted, Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document. 6. Kāinga Ora seeks all necessary consequential changes to give effect to the relief sought.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> In relation to point 4, refer to recommendations on S122.20.	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197.FS.1	S122.163.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission in part	The RVA supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (inclusion of design outcomes in matters of discretion and objectives and policies) as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Allow primary submission regarding removal of Design Guidelines in full, but otherwise disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.5	S122.163.FS02	Landlink	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission	Support the notion that design guides should not be included in the Plan Change in a capacity whereby they act as 'defacto rules to be complied with'. Although good practice design is welcomed and this process has to include flexibility for innovation to cater for unique positive outcomes which sit outside of the scope of the guidelines.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S122.163.FS03	Ryman Healthcare Limited	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission in part	Ryman supports the general submission point seeking the removal of the Design Guidelines, but opposes the specific relief sought in this submission point (inclusion of design outcomes in matters of discretion and objectives and policies) as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow primary submission regarding removal of Design Guidelines in full, but otherwise disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S122.163.FS04	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161.FS.1	S122.163.FS05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangātira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangātira	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout the Kāpiti district.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S122.163.FS06	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Oppose primary submission	The Design Guides are an important tool for providing detail on the design outcomes sought. Retain Design Guides with amendments as requested in our primary submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S122	S122.164	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	APPx2 - Centres Design Guide	Oppose	See submission point S122.162	See decision requested for submission point S122.162	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.165	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	APP6 – CPTED Guidelines	Oppose	See submission point S122.162	See decision requested for submission point S122.162	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S122	S122.166	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	APP20 – Centres Design Principles	Oppose	See submission point S122.162	See decision requested for submission point S122.162	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S160.FS.1	S122.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	The submitter opposes the level of intensification proposed by Kainga Ora around Kapiti.  The submitter states that most dwellings in Kapiti are one-storey with a few two-stories dwellings. Any dwellings higher than 3-storeys will result in inappropriate use and development of the coastal area and will not maintain the beach and suburban character of Kapiti.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S220.FS.1	S122.FS02	Boyd, Jacob	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	The submitter opposes the level of intensification proposed by Kainga Ora around Kapiti.  The submitter states that most dwellings in Kapiti are one-storey with a few two-stories dwellings. Any dwellings higher than 3-storeys will result in inappropriate use and development of the coastal area and will not maintain the beach and suburban character of Kapiti.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S221.FS.1	S122.FS03	Crow, Adam	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the level of intensification proposed by Kainga Ora around Kapiti.  Specific opposition to proposed heights in residential zones adjacent to the local centre zone, town centre zone, and metropolitan centre zone, and the proposed rezoning and/or zoning extensions.  Higher intensification will result in the loss of privacy, sunlight, and sense of community.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S074.FS.1	S122.FS04	Hazelton, Andrew	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the full submission by Kainga Ora.  The submitter refers to further submission S227.FS.1 and S098.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190.FS.1	S122.FS05	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the full submission by Kainga Ora.  The submitter refers to further submission S227.FS.1 and S098.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S177.FS.1	S122.FS06	Cathie, Richard	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	Oppose the submission made by Kainga Ora on the grounds that most of the area is increasingly prone to flooding and coastal hazards and is unsuitable for the type of development contemplated by the submission.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191.FS.1	S122.FS07	Lambert, Nicholas	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the full submission by Kainga Ora.  The submitter refers to further submission S227.FS.1 and S098.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S193.FS.1	S122.FS08	Lambert, William	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the full submission by Kainga Ora.  The submitter refers to further submission S227.FS.1 and S098.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S233.FS.1	S122.FS09	Helson, Lindsay	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submission opposes the full submission by Kainga Ora.  Allowing construction of up to 18 metres (six storeys) in a settled urban area comprising of single storey residences would destroy the kaupapa and amenity value of the area.  S122 disregards the rules requiring buildings of 18 metres height to be no more than 800m from a transport or railway hub, which the Jolly Pub isn't.  Concerns regarding damage to existing development through the construction of foundations and infrastructure.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S238.FS.1	S122.FS10	Heads, Ann	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	This submitter opposes the proposal by Kainga Ora.  Oppose heights of 18m.  Refer to S098.FS.1 and S227.FS.1 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S122.FS11	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission. Do not show any understanding of the local infrastructure limitations in Waikanae East, or consideration for the negative environmental and mental health effects of intensification. Need to better care for the well-being of the inhabitants.	Disallow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S123	S123.01	Liakhovskaia, Stacey	Rongomau Lane, Raumati South	Not specified	The Rongomau Lane is adjacent to well-established residential Leinster Avenue community. It has approximately 20 dwellings with the recent development added a few dwellings. Since SH1 was built, it is no longer rural. For rates and postal purposes it is already classified as Urban.  The sections with residential buildings or potential, previously acquired by the Crown for SH1 construction, are now disposed to private owners and NZTA designation is removed (like 45 and 47 Rongomau Lane). The community has a sealed road access and all the services (water supply, sewer, stormwater, fibre and power) on the road. It is in a close proximity to Raumati South community centre.  The geotech study for 47 Rongomau Lane got evidence that the building platform is on a good ground and the risk of liquefaction is quite low due to high density of the soil (under the 40-60 cm of loose top soil). The council confirmed the site is suitable for residential construction issuing the building consent in June 2022.	Amend the proposed rezoning of at 39 Rongomau Lane to include 47 Rongomau Lane (and maybe 45 Rongomau Lane).	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	I address both S123.01 and S125.01 in this assessment.  The submitter requests two additional sites be included in the 39 Rongomau Lane land proposed to be rezoned General Residential as part of PC(N).  The sites requested are entirely located within the NZTA-005 designation (state highway purposes). The rezoning of the site would be inconsistent with the designation. The rezoning of these two sites would not provide a notable contribution to plan-enabled housing either.  Therefore, I do not consider it appropriate to include these two sites in the rezoning proposed for 39 Rongomau Lane as part of PC(N).	Do not accept.	No.
S053.FS.1	S123.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Rongomau Lane, Raumati South	Oppose primary submission	The proposed rezoning of land is next to an expressway. The health and amenity to future occupants living next to the expressway should be considered and managed, as well as access arrangements.  Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.	Disallow primary submission. Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S123.01.FS02	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Rongomau Lane, Raumati South	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S123	S123.02	Liakhovskaia, Stacey	Rongomau Lane, Raumati South	Not specified	See submission point S123.01.	Make a plan for further Rongomau Lane development to fit for growing community. Open the direct access to Rongomau Lane from the roundabout (now the access is via Leinster Avenue), confirm that the services' (power, fibre, water, sewer) capacity is enough for 100+ proposed dwellings, extend the sewer pipes to the end of cul de sac, build a kids play ground in this area (Maybe the Crown could dedicate 244 or 252 Main Road for this?)	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider that these matters are more appropriately addressed either through the Council's Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy, or are addressed through the range provisions in the District Plan that require the provision of infrastructure as part of subdivision and development (which I describe in section 4.2.5 of the body of the report).	Do not accept.	No.
S124	S124.01	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character". - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. - Appropriate Coastal Qualifying and Beach Residential Precincts would have an insignificant effect on intensification potential.	Delete the current Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct which is based on Section 6(a), and which has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter C in the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend CE-R1 and CE-R2 (refer section 16.2 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report for details.
S203.FS.1	S124.01.FS01	Nga Hapu o Otaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. We realise these culturally significant coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions.  The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S124	S124.02	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S124.01.	If the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is retained, amend Plan Change 2 to introduce consistent Qualifying Matter Precincts to address overland flow paths, flood hazards and ponding. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter D in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S124	S124.03	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S124.01.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S124	S124.04	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S124.01.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S124	S124.05	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - It is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Zones as they are impacted by any enlarged Coastal Qualifying Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct. - There is inconsistent treatment of Local Centres. - There has been no assessment of the need for the Local Centre at Te Moana in the view of the likely impact of the Local Centre at Ngarara. - Local centres and their surrounds have not been assessed as to their ability to absorb the effects they will be subject to, or whether the Local Centre is commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services, as required by policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> the District Plan maps to specifically identify the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara, and apply Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 to a relevant walkable catchment at that centre. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter I in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S209.FS.1	S124.05.FS01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Support a residential intensification precinct being applied around the Local Centre Zone at Ngarara (walkable catchment). For further rationale see S209. Support this proposal as the identification of Ngarara as a Local Centre (and subsequently an intensification precinct focal point) provides the beach and surrounding Te Moana communities with a focal point with room for future growth. The proposed 'bakery' area is modest and very limited in terms of expansion potential. Such a modest scale of commercial activity would not provide for higher densities of urban form. Given the anticipated development in the Mixed Use Zone at Ngarara, identifying this area as a Local Centre Zone is feasible and will give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. Identifying a Local Centre Zone would provide further rationale for rezoning and utilising development capacity at 100-110 Te Moana Road, which would be within a walkable catchment.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S124	S124.06	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S124.05.	<b>Rezone</b> the Local Centre Zone at Te Moana to General Residential Zone (but allowing for continued operation of established businesses under existing use and/or existing resource consent as exists with the Waikanae Beach 4 Square and the Long Beach and Front Room cafes). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S124	S124.07	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S124.05.	If submission S124.06 is not accepted, <b>limit</b> the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to the actual Local Centre Zone or such smaller zone to the east of the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct, or otherwise as the Panel determines. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S124	S124.08	Patterson, Andrena and Bruce	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	See submission point S124.05.	<b>Amend</b> other Local Centre Zones (other than those at Te Moana Road and Ngarara) as required to give effect to a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct or enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S125	S125.01	Liakhovskii, Sergei	Rongomau Lane, Raumati South	Not specified	The Rongomau Lane is adjacent to well-established residential Leinster Avenue community. It has approximately 20 dwellings with the recent development added a few dwellings. Since SH1 was built, it is no longer rural. For rates and postal purposes it is already classified as Urban.  The sections with residential buildings or potential, previously acquired by the Crown for SH1 construction, are now disposed to private owners and NZTA designation is removed (like 45 and 47 Rongomau Lane). The community has a sealed road access and all the services (water supply, sewer, stormwater, fibre and power) on the road. It is in a close proximity to Raumati South community centre.  The geotech study for 47 Rongomau Lane got evidence that the building platform is on a good ground and the risk of liquefaction is quite low due to high density of the soil (under the 40-60 cm of loose top soil). The council confirmed the site is suitable for residential construction issuing the building consent in June 2022.	<b>Amend</b> the proposed rezoning of at 39 Rongomau Lane to include 47 Rongomau Lane.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	See assessment for S123.01.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S125.01.FS01	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	Rongomau Lane, Raumati South	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S126	S126.01	Rys, Susan	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S126.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged landward of the proposed eastern boundary. We agree that 'Coastal Environments' should not be confined to a narrow strip of coast subject only to coastal erosion the area identified should include other known coastal hazards being identified and predicted to affect our district such as flooding, ground saturation, storm surge etc. We also agree that the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast are sensitive areas which should be protected from further intensification and we further point out the areas are culturally significant. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S126	S126.02	Rys, Susan	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S126.01 is not accepted, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S126.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. We have technical iwi environmental scientists who agree with the point of flooding being an accumulated and inter-related factor to sea level rise and erosion that will impact on our coast as per known predictions of climate change. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S126	S126.03	Rys, Susan	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S126.01 and S126.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S126	S126.04	Rys, Susan	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S126.01 and S126.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S127	S127.01	Cochrane, Andrew and Merus	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S127.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct needs to be enlarged landward of the proposed eastern boundary. We agree that the 'Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct' should not be confined to a narrow strip of coast subject to coastal erosion, the area identified should include other known coastal hazards being identified and predicted to affect our district such as flooding, ground saturation, storm surge etc. We also agree that the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast are sensitive areas which need be protected from further intensification and we further point out the areas are culturally significant. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S127	S127.02	Cochrane, Andrew and Merus	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S127.01 is not accepted, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S127.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond what has been proposed in the draft plan. We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. We have technical iwi environmental scientists who agree with the point of flooding and other climate change impacts being compounded, accumulated and inter-related with sea level rise and along our coast environments. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S127	S127.03	Cochrane, Andrew and Merus	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S127.01 and S127.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S127	S127.04	Cochrane, Andrew and Merus	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S127.01 and S127.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S128	S128.01	Mazur, Richard	160-222 Main Road, Paraparaumu	Support	The submission supports the rezoning of 160-222 Main Road, Paraparaumu, because it: a. Provides the opportunity to create areas of affordable housing; b. Provides a catalyst for re-vitalisation of the area; c. Makes better use of the area that is convenient to the town centre, shopping, and commuter services.	<b>Approve</b> the proposed rezoning of 160-222 Main Road, Paraparaumu as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S129	S129.01	Wakem, Leon	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218) and the WBRIS submission (S105).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S129.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond the Takutai Kāpiti Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2. We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. Our culturally significant coastal environments along with our all our communities will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S129	S129.02	Wakem, Leon	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S129.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S130	S130.01	Turver, Chris	General	Support in part	The submission supports the recognition of Kārewarewa Urupā because it recognises a historic wāhi tapu site, and could open the way for a valued community park-like asset.  The submission identifies key issues associated with the proposal, including: - lack of maintenance of the land has created a fire hazard; - there has been a lack of action in dealing with the deteriorating state of the land; - who is responsible for maintaining what could become a valued cultural reserve and community asset open to the public; - what steps will be taken to satisfy Fire and emergency that a fire threat to 50 surrounding houses has been minimised; - is papakāinga development to be allowed on the site; - it is unreasonable to expect ratepayers to approve this part of Plan Change 2 without solutions in place.	<b>Clarify:</b> - what will be done with the urupā site - left untended or managed; - whether the public will have continued access; - who will be responsible for effective upkeep of the site and fire prevention; - what steps will be taken to satisfy Fire & Emergency that a fire threat to 50 neighbouring houses has been eliminated; - what penalties will be in place for non-compliance with upkeep.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	In relation to the matters for which the submitter seeks clarification, I note the following: - The ongoing management of the site is not a matter that is determined by the District Plan. Rather, I consider that the ongoing management of the site (including with respect to public access, upkeep and fire safety/prevention) is principally the responsibility of the land owner. - The District Plan does not manage or provide for penalties in relation non-compliance with upkeep.	<b>No recommendation.</b> No decision requested.	<b>No.</b>
S104.FS.1	S130.01.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	General	Oppose primary submission	<i>WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S100.FS.1	S130.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Support primary submission	<i>Support the recognition of Kārewarewa Urupā as a wāhi tapu Oppose any determination on the future use of the site, including rezoning for open space through this process. A site management plan should be developed to support the wāhi tapu listing that would address the matters raised in submission 130. Retain Kārewarewa urupā as Wāhanga tahi and Wāhanga rua through amendments to Schedule 9 – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori the "Historical, Cultural, Infrastructure and Districtwide" map series. The boundary of WTSx1 – Kārewarewa Urupā (Wāhanga Tahi) is extended to include Lot 4 as per the Ngarara West A14B1 block surveyed boundary shown in Figure 3 of our primary submission.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S203.FS.1	S130.01.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	<i>NHoO support the TAA position and submission regarding Kārewarewa Urupā</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S131	S131.01	Macleay, Sarah	General	Support	This submission supports the proposed plan change 2 to the Operative Kāpiti Coast District Plan 2021.	<b>Approve</b> Plan Change 2 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Subject to recommendations to amend PC(N) made throughout this document.	<b>No.</b>
S132	S132.01	Hager, Mandy	General	Support in part	The submission supports the proposed changes for land use and development.  Seeks papakāinga housing developments be extended to all property owners to: - Address the housing crisis; - Develop better community support for the elderly/those with disabilities; - Increase resilience of families in challenging times.	<b>Amend</b> papakāinga provisions to extend to non-Māori landowners in Kāpiti.	4.3 Papakāinga	As identified in the Section 32 Evaluation Report, the objectives, policies and rules that enable tangata whenua to develop papakāinga on ancestral land are part of giving effect to the Council's obligation under s6(e) of the RMA to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.  I consider that the amendments sought are not consistent with s6(e) of the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S132.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Oppose primary submission	<i>Ātiawa support the submission points seeking for PC2 to: - Address the housing crisis; - Develop better community support for the elderly/those with disabilities; - Increase resilience of families in challenging times. Papakāinga will contribute to these matters. However, as papakāinga is a uniquely tangata whenua approach for the reasons addressed in our primary submission, a separate policy approach is needed to address those submission point S132.01. Retain papakāinga provisions as notified in respect to this submission point.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.3 Papakāinga	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S161.FS.1	S132.01.FS02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Oppose primary submission	<i>We oppose this submission because papakāinga are unique to tangata whenua and these provisions have been developed for the specific needs of tangata whenua. Although the submission makes valid points about addressing the housing crisis and developing resilience for the community, this is not the appropriate platform and /or appropriate District Plan Chapter to address these issues.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.3 Papakāinga	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S203.FS.1	S132.01.FS03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose primary submission	<i>Papakāinga are unique to tangata whenua. This chapter has been developed to help tangata whenua navigate the specific issues that they face when it comes to developing on their ancestral whenua.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission.</i>	4.3 Papakāinga	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S133	S133.01	Wilson, Rochelle	General	Support	This submission supports the proposed intensification, design, and setback provisions.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S133	S133.02	Wilson, Rochelle	General	Not specified	The submission notes that many homeowners are opting for a dark roof colour, which is facilitating the absorption of heat. Solar panels and rainwater collection tanks should be permitted on properties where this would be beneficial.	Consider these matters as part of making a decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I note the matter raised by the submitter in regard to roof colour, PC2 does not seek to regulate roof colour (nor do I consider this necessary in order to incorporate the MDRS or give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD).  In relation to solar panels and rainwater collection tanks, both these matters are permitted by rules and encouraged by policies in the District Plan.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider that solar panels and rainwater tanks are already provided for by the operative District Plan as amended by PC(N).	No.
S133	S133.03	Wilson, Rochelle	General	Not specified	The submission notes that no priority has been given to retail or educational facilities being included on the ground floor of medium density housing. The population in some areas of Kāpiti could make this a suitable use of space.	Consider these matters as part of making a decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to retail facilities, within the Centres and Mixed Use Zones, retail activities would be a permitted activity on the ground floor of a housing development. In the General Residential Zone, retail activities are generally discouraged on the basis that district objective DO-O16 seeks that the district's centres are the primary focus for retail activities. However, rule GRZ-R14 would provide for a limited amount of retail activity to occur (in the form of a <i>local convenience retail outlet</i> ) on the ground floor of residential development, in certain locations in the General Residential Zone. I do not consider it appropriate to alter this approach.  In relation to educational facilities, if these are provided by the Ministry of Education, then the Minister has the power to designate land for this purpose. However, in relation to private educational, childcare or early childhood facilities, these are not specifically provided for in the District Plan. I consider that they are likely to fall within the broad definition of <i>commercial activity</i> , which means they would be a non-complying activity in the General Residential Zone, and a permitted activity in the Centres and Mixed Use Zone. I consider this appropriate, as there are likely to be a range of effects associated with such facilities that are appropriate to consider through a resource consent process.	Do not accept.	No.
S133	S133.04	Wilson, Rochelle	General	Not specified	The submission notes there is no mention of increased bus routes or frequency to service the suburbs which would otherwise require private transportation.	Consider these matters as part of making a decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that for the purposes of the application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, PC2 does not consider any bus service in the Kāpiti Coast district to meet the definition of a rapid transit service.  I consider that the provision of increased bus service routes or frequency is a matter that is managed by the Greater Wellington Regional Council, and not a matter that can be managed through the District Plan.	Do not accept.	No.
S133	S133.05	Wilson, Rochelle	General	Not specified	The submission notes no confidence in flood-prone and low-lying sea side areas being left as sand-dunes, parks, wetlands, or wilderness.	Consider these matters as part of making a decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	There are a range of operative District Plan provisions that will continue to recognise and provide for the matters outlined by the submitter as <i>qualifying matters</i> , including (but not limited to): - Flood hazard provisions, which manage development in relation to the range of flood hazards identified in the District Plan; - Provisions which restrict development in outstanding natural features and landscapes; - Provisions which require development to be set-back from waterbodies (including wetlands); - Provisions which restrict development in scheduled ecological sites; - Retaining (with the exception of two small areas) existing areas zoned as Open Space.	Do not accept. Noting that I consider that these matters are already provided for by the operative District Plan as amended by PC(N).	No.
S134	S134.01	Smith, Jan	General	Support in part	This submission supports the proposed changes for high density housing, provided that land is set aside for parks and recreation. Kāpiti needs to plan beautiful spaces which encourage children and adults to enjoy nature.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2, but seeks further information on the provision of outdoor space associated with high density housing for the purpose of compensation for the loss of the traditional back yard.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to setting aside land for parks and recreation, I note that the District Plan requires new housing development to pay a financial contribution (in money or land) towards the provision of new or improved reserves and open spaces.  In relation to outdoor living space, the provisions of PC2 require new development to include either private or communal outdoor living space to be provided for to meet minimum size and shape standards, in a manner that is accessible to each unit.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S135	S135.01	Jones, Lesley	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	This submission opposes the proposed changes to the District Plan for the following reasons: - The existing housing layout and type of homes built was not designed to have 4 storey buildings among them. Creates risk that existing homes will receive no sunlight and have no privacy. - The design guidelines show multi-storey buildings in situations where they have been accommodated from the beginning. This is not the case at Raumati Beach. - The area has already experienced an increase in traffic, particularly at the beginning and end of the school day. More people and cars will make it increasingly difficult to cross the road around the village area.	Amend proposed policy GRZ-Px6 to a maximum 2 storey height limit, unless developers can prove the building will have no negative impacts to existing homes.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Amending PC2 to require a maximum 2 storey building height in the General Residential Zone is contrary to the requirements of the MDRS (which requires buildings 3-storeys (11 metres) to be permitted). It is also contrary to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, which requires the District Plan to enable increased building heights and densities to be enabled within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and rapid transit stops, as well as adjacent to Town and Local Centre Zones.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S135.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S135.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Support primary submission	NHO supports the recommendation for intensification to have more regard for neighbouring properties and community values.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S136	S136.01	Trow, Richard	293 SH1, Paekākāriki, 5034	Not specified	This submission references a specific property, which is currently zoned Rural. The submitter would like to be able to subdivide and build on this section of land.	Rezone 293 State Highway 1, Paekākāriki, from General Rural Zone to a zone that allows subdivision.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S137	S137.01	Gibbons, Christine	Waikanae	Oppose	This submission opposes the proposed changes to the District Plan for the following reasons: - It would drastically change the character of the area and limit natural light to surrounding buildings; - Waikanae has always been a coastal small town and allowing 3 storey buildings would make it feel like a high density busy city.	Do not allow 3 storey buildings in Waikanae, except in exceptional circumstances.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S137.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S137.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Waikanae	Support primary submission	NHO supports the recommendation for intensification to have more regard for neighbouring properties and community values.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S138	S138.01	Holman, Linda	Ventnor Drive, Paraparaumu	Oppose	This submission opposes Ventnor Drive and the surrounding areas being rezoned to General Residential, for the following reasons: - It is important to keep areas with lower density housing in order to have trees and other habitat to support wildlife; - Residents have already noticed a reduction of birdlife, which are very sensitive to changes in their environment; - Local people park in Ventnor Drive and walk along the surrounding roads to enjoy a countryside environment, which could be reduced with residential development.	<b>Do not rezone</b> Ventnor Drive and surrounding areas to General Residential.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The area around Ventnor Drive in Paraparaumu is already zoned General Residential Zone in the operative District Plan, and PC2 does not propose to change this.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S139	S139.01	Ringrose, Paul	Paekākāriki	Not specified	The submitter notes that population growth for Paekākāriki is untenable, the infrastructure could not cope with an increase in numbers.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	While I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitter, in relation to infrastructure capacity, I consider that the District Plan can only make the requirements of the MDRS or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD less enabling of development if it is necessary to do so to provide for a qualifying matter, and I have outlined in section 4.2.5 of the body of the report why I do not consider infrastructure capacity to be a qualifying matter. In relation to the specific matter of the lack of Council reticulated wastewater infrastructure at Paekākāriki, I note that this is described in section 6.1.6 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report.	<b>No recommendation.</b> No decision requested.	<b>No.</b>
S140	S140.01	Dinniss, Philip	Old Waikanae Beach precinct	Oppose	This submission opposes the intensification of building density in the Old Waikanae Beach precinct for the following reasons: - The area lacks the drainage infrastructure to support more buildings and the associated runoff; - The soak pit solution to groundwater issues is no longer sufficient for this community; - The blanket directive from the government gives little room for KCDC to make provisions for the region's special characteristics.	<b>Provide</b> for special feature areas in a similar manner to those provided for tangata whenua and <b>identify</b> the established residential areas which lack infrastructure for inclusion in the plan at a later date (once infrastructure is available).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider this would be inconsistent with the requirement to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Waikanae Beach. In relation to whether infrastructure capacity can be considered as a qualifying matter, I do not consider this to be the case, and I explain this further in section 4.2.5 of the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S141	S141.01	van Beek, Hanne	Ōtaki	Oppose	This submission opposes the intensification of Ōtaki for the following reasons: - Growth should not come at the expense of the character of the district; - Intensification is short sighted and reduces future attraction for the area; - The community has already lost something with new rules detailing where people can build on their section, which shouldn't be aggravated by allowing intensive development.	<b>Judiciously select</b> areas for intensive development (both density and height) with input from community.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD provide direction on where increased levels of development must be enabled, and the District Plan must give effect to this direction.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S141.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Ōtaki	Support primary submission	<i>NHOo supports the recommendation for intensification to have regard for neighbouring properties and community values and to not allow the intensification to be applied in Ōtaki.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S142	S142.01	Peacock, Anna	189 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Not specified	This submission proposes rezoning rural land on the outskirts of existing residential areas, for the following reasons: - The access to these properties is within 1km of the Waikanae urban area with easy cycling access along the Old State Highway; - The property at 189 Main Road North (old State Highway 1) and surrounding properties are located between the lifestyle precinct at Peka Peka, the eco-hamlet precinct, and across the railway line from other rural lifestyle zoned land; - The sections of land average 3-5ha that is unable to be further subdivided, surrounded by land which is able to be subdivided to 1ha lots; - These properties have historically been limited by direct access onto State Highway 1, however the new highway bypasses these sections; - The land is not highly productive and has already been subdivided to an extent that makes economic production difficult; - The land is undulating clay foothills with limited topsoil (land use capability Class 6s16).	<b>Rezone</b> this property and surrounding properties (173 to 191 Main Road North, Waikanae) from General Rural Zone to a form of large lot residential, settlement, or lifestyle zoning.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S053.FS.1	S142.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	189 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	<i>The greenfield development proposed is located away from existing centre zones, employment opportunities and accessibility to public and active transport modes meaning that the development of this area has the potential to result in an isolated, low density urban settlement.</i>  <i>Access from this site will be funnelled into SH1 at intersection with Rahui Road. The vehicle movements on at this intersection will need to be considered.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission point.</i> <i>Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.</i>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>
S054.FS.1	S142.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	189 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Support primary submission	<i>Support this submission.</i> <i>SUPPORT the re-zoning of Waikanae North first</i> <i>- to allow for much greater housing intensification</i> <i>- the building of another primary school to cater for Waikanae Beach and Waikanae North students and thus reducing emissions of some Waikanae parents</i> <i>- make Waikanae East safer, and more able to cope with possible intensification in the future (after the 3rd school is built)</i> <i>- reduce emissions further due to excellent bike lane connectivity between Waikanae North and Waikanae Central/ Railway Station</i> <i>- when the railway line is further electrified to Ōtaki, an extra station could be built at Waikanae North/Pekapeka with an overbridge across the road to facilitate access</i> <i>- this land is sand/peat based. It is not high class agricultural soil.</i> <i>Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>
S100.FS.1	S142.01.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	189 State Highway 1, Waikanae	Support primary submission	<i>Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal.</i> <i>Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast.</i> <i>KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.</i> <i>Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission in part.</i>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>	<i>Primary submission is out of scope.</i>
S143	S143.01	Watutsi Trust	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Not specified	This submission proposes rezoning unproductive rural land pockets to a more intensive peri-urban development, for the following reasons: - The current zoning of 155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka, has not resulted in efficient use of land resource; - These properties are located on elevated sites, on rolling inland dunes, that are not suitable for rural production activities; - The soil is sand with a very thin covering of wind-blown material (land use capability Class 6e5), which is very poor soil for growing crops or pasture to support grazing animals; - The level of existing development on these properties and the modification that has already occurred on them means that they are not areas of high natural character in the coastal environment; - 155-205 Paetawa Road (and 152-210 Paetawa Road on the coastal side) are the only properties along this road which cannot subdivide to a minimum of 1ha, as the rest of the properties are residential zoned; - These properties are currently connected to potable water and are within a 50km road speed zone, but are unable to develop in the same ways as surrounding properties.	<b>Rezone</b> 155-205 Paetawa Road (and any other properties with similar characteristics) to large lot residential or settlement zoning, enabling lots of 2,000-6,000m2.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S143.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takatū Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S143.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Oppose primary submission	KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S144	S144.01	Marshall, Graeme and Christine	General	Oppose	This submission opposes the proposed changes to the District Plan. They would like clarification from KCDC regarding: - Ensuring that the main arterial routes and infrastructure can cater for increased traffic; - Ensuring that during development of residential areas, trucks are confined to the main roads. This will limit the impact of the health and safety of current residents, especially where there are blind corners and bends which could put elderly and young people at risk; - Ensuring that those living in neighbouring areas to a proposed development are adequately consulted; - Ensuring careful consultation is undertaken with developers as to what is built, to guarantee that future houses have garages and carports.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2, but seeks further information on how KCDC will manage future developments and the potential effects on neighbours.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to the matters raised by the submitter, I note that: - Transport network capacity generally is managed through the Council's Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy. Specific developments are subject to the rules in the Transport Chapter of the District Plan, which require resource consent for developments that breach vehicle trip generation thresholds. This enables the consideration of effects increased traffic generation on the capacity of the transport network. - In relation to health and safety of the transport network, there are a range of design standards for vehicle access in the Transport chapter (including access widths, separation distances and sight lines) that must be met as part of new development. - In relation to construction traffic, there are no specific standards for construction traffic within the District Plan. However, effects related to construction traffic can be considered as part of resource consents for new development in a range of zones including the General Residential and Centres Zones, and conditions can be applied to resource consents to manage these effects. - In relation to consultation with neighbours, I note that the MDRS require public and limited notification of resource consents to be precluded for developments with 4 or more residential units in the General Residential Zone. However, limited notification (including notification of neighbours) is still allowed where a development breaches a density standard (such as building height, setbacks, or height in relation to boundary standards). - In relation to garages and carports, Policy 11 of the NPS-UD prevents the District Plan from requiring the provision of car parking (unless it relates to accessible parking).	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S145	S145.01	Cobeldick, Paul	Paekākāriki	Not specified	The submission opposes the proposed increase in building height to 6 storeys for the following reasons: - 6 storey height is too tall for Paekākāriki, as it is a housing area and not a central city; - Concerns regarding shade, vision, appearance, lack of privacy, septic tanks and soak away problems, and dodgy building developers; - Would result in a detrimental alteration of the village space, loss of character, and property values. The submission supports a maximum of 3 storeys in Paekākāriki.	Amend the provisions allowing 6 storey development to a maximum of 3 storeys in Paekākāriki.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested would be inconsistent with the requirement for the District Plan to give effect to Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD, which requires the District Plan to enable building heights of at least 6-storeys within a walkable catchment of Paekākāriki train station.	Do not accept.	No.
S146					SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
S147	S147.01	Oakley, Andy	General	Oppose	The submission opposes the papakāinga provisions on the basis that they are exclusive to tangata whenua.	Amend Plan Change 2 to remove the words "tangata whenua" and replace them with "the people of Kāpiti".	4.3 Papakāinga	As identified in the Section 32 Evaluation Report, the objectives, policies and rules that enable tangata whenua to develop papakāinga on ancestral land are part of giving effect to the Council's obligation under s6(e) of the RMA to recognise and provide for the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.  I consider that the amendments sought are not consistent with s6(e) of the RMA.	Do not accept.	No.
S161.FS.1	S147.01.FS01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Oppose primary submission	As mentioned in the earlier parts of our submission, papakāinga are unique to tangata whenua. This chapter has been developed to help tangata whenua navigate the specific issues that they face when it comes to developing on their ancestral whenua. Oppose submitter's request of "removing the words tangata whenua and replace them with the people of Kāpiti".	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S147.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose primary submission	Papakāinga are unique to tangata whenua. This chapter has been developed to help tangata whenua navigate the specific issues that they face when it comes to developing on their ancestral whenua.	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S147	S147.02	Oakley, Andy	General	Oppose	Refer to submission point S147.01	Amend Plan Change 2 to remove the words "papakāinga housing developments" and replace them with "community housing developments".	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to S147.01.	Do not accept.	No.
S161.FS.1	S147.02.FS01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Oppose primary submission	As mentioned in the earlier parts of our submission, papakāinga are unique to tangata whenua. This chapter has been developed to help tangata whenua navigate the specific issues that they face when it comes to developing on their ancestral whenua. Oppose submitter's request of "removing the words tangata whenua and replace them with the people of Kāpiti".	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S147.02.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose primary submission	Papakāinga are unique to tangata whenua. This chapter has been developed to help tangata whenua navigate the specific issues that they face when it comes to developing on their ancestral whenua.	Disallow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S148	S148.01	Hynd, Clare	Raumati South	Not specified	This submission supports no more than 2 storeys in the area of Raumati/Raumati South. Reluctantly in support of 3 storeys around the Raumati South shops. Does not want more intensification than what is required by the national government legislation.	Amend the provisions to allow a maximum of 2 storeys in the area of Raumati/Raumati South, and a maximum of 3 storeys around the Raumati South shops.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S149	S149.01	McMahon, Frederick	General	Oppose	This submission opposes the provision for 3 storey development in Kāpiti. There appears to be many sites around the district that would be appropriate for high rise buildings, while not impacting existing single storey dwellings.	Amend the provisions to not allow 3 storey development to be built amongst single storey dwellings.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S149.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission. It is logical that these other sites be used for high rise buildings first.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S149.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	NHoO supports the recommendation for intensification to have more regard for neighbouring properties and community values.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S150	S150.01	Stevenson, Douglas	General	Oppose	This submission opposes the provision for 3 storey development in Kāpiti. If these provisions are included, the submitter would like to see provisions included which ensures neighbours properties are not impacted (views, sunlight).	Amend the provisions to ensure existing single storey residential development is not impacted by medium-density housing.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054.FS.1	S150.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S150.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	NHoO supports the recommendation for intensification to have more regard for neighbouring properties and community values.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S151	S151.01	Foster, Dan	Waikanae	Oppose	This submission opposes the provision for 3 storey development in Kāpiti, for the following reasons: - People live in Kāpiti because it is not a city, has space to move, and its not crammed full of people; - Concerned that developers will be 'throwing' houses up, taking the money, and moving on quickly; - Concerned that the quality of life of existing residents will decline (privacy, existing views being built out, lack of sunlight).	Amend the provisions to exclude Waikanae from the intensification rules being proposed, and protect the quality of life of existing homeowners.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S151.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S152	S152.01	Davey, Frederick	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	This submission proposes amending the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts to extend 300-400m inland from the coast.	Amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts to extend 300-400m inland from the coast.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I do not consider that there is sufficient evidence to justify extending the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the manner requested.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.02	Davey, Frederick	DO-03	Not specified	DO-03 Item 4: "Natural hazard events" should exclude "coastal zone" until a better understanding of future sea-level rise is known.	Amend DO-03 Item 4 to exclude "coastal zone".	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be supporting of or consequential on incorporating the MDRS or giving effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S152.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-03	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond a narrow strip of coast solely related to coastal erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be 3-400m extended inland but also beyond to align with the Adaptation Zones identified in the Published Takutai Kāpiti project We recommend the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S152	S152.03	Davey, Frederick	DO-011 (Explanatory Text)	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 1.12 - Amend the explanatory text to objective DO-011 as follows. Submitter would like the description regarding Paraparaumu Beach back to "avoiding" from "managing" along the coastal edge.	Amend the explanatory text to DO-011 to remove the word "managing" and replace with "avoiding".	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be supporting of or consequential on incorporating the MDRS or giving effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.04	Davey, Frederick	DO-011 (Explanatory Text)	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 1.12 - Amend the explanatory text to objective DO-011 as follows. Submitter would like the language describing Otahanga changed.	The submission did not state what they would like the description changed to.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought, and the submitter may wish to clarify this at the hearing.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.05	Davey, Frederick	UDF-P4	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 2.5 - Amend policy UDF-P4 as follows. Delete or define "walkable" and "adjacent". Some people walk 30km.	Amend UDF-P4 define "walkable" and "adjacent".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider it necessary to define the terms "walkable" and "adjacent" in the policy, because the areas to which these terms apply are spatially defined as Residential Intensification Precinct A and B. I consider this provides sufficient certainty to District Plan users about the spatial extent where increased building heights and densities are to be enabled.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.06	Davey, Frederick	Papakāinga chapter	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 3.0 - Proposed new Papakāinga Chapter. The submitter would like clarity regarding whether this chapter is from direction instruction from central government. Specifically regarding definitions.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.3 Papakāinga	There was no central government direction or instruction to include papakāinga provisions (including definitions relating to papakāinga) in PC(N). The Section 32 Evaluation Report identifies (at p.106) that "the need for the District Plan to better provide for the development of papakāinga was raised with the Council by iwi authorities prior to PC2, including through submissions on the LTP and Te tupu pai. The papakāinga provisions that have been incorporated into PC(N) are the result of a collaborative effort by tangata whenua and Council to develop a set of provisions that reflect tangata whenua aspirations for the use and development of papakāinga on their ancestral land in the District."	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S152	S152.07	Davey, Frederick	GRZ-P4, GRZ-P5	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 4.10 - Amend policy GRZ-P4 as follows and section 4.11 - Amend policy GRZ-P5 as follows. The submitter would like these provisions to apply to all coastal development.	Revise other chapters to include the provisions in GRZ-P4 and GRZ-P5.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	GRZ-P4 and GRZ-P5 relate to the Beach Residential Precincts and the Waikanae Beach Residential Precinct. These precincts do not apply to other zones, so I do not consider it appropriate to include these policies in other zones either.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.08	Davey, Frederick	Town Centre Zone: Introduction; TCZ-Px1	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 6.1 - Add the following text t the end of the Zone introduction and section 6.5 - Add a new policy (after policy TCZ-P7) as follows. The submitter would like these provisions to apply to Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts in working zones in Paraparaumu Beach.	Revise other chapters to include the provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in Town Centre Zone: Introduction and TCZ-Px1.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	PC(N) includes provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in only those zones where the precinct is located. I do not consider it appropriate to include these provisions in other zones where the precinct is not located.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.09	Davey, Frederick	Local Centre Zone: Introduction; LCZ-Px1	Not specified	This submission is in regard to section 7.1 - Add the following text to the end of the Zone introduction, section 7.6 - Add a new policy (after policy LCZ-P7) as follows, and section 7.7 - Amend rule LCZ-R6 as follows. The submitter would like these provisions to apply to Paraparaumu Beach as well.	Revise other chapters to include the provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in Local Centre Zone: Introduction and LCZ-Px1.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	PC(N) includes provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in only those zones where the precinct is located. I do not consider it appropriate to include these provisions in other zones where the precinct is not located.	Do not accept.	No.
S152	S152.10	Davey, Frederick	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Not specified	This submission is in regard to maps. The submitter suggests the limits of the Residential Intensification Precinct B are arbitrary.	The submission does not request a specific decision on Plan Change 2.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Appendix E to the Section 32 Evaluation Report describes how the boundaries of Residential Intensification Precinct B have been determined.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S153	S153.01	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	GRZ-R6	Oppose	The measurement criteria for a minor residential unit refers to including "covered yards" but excludes "covered outdoor living spaces". We consider, this creates a contradiction that should be avoided or clarified.	Amend GRZ-R6 as follows: ... When measuring gross floor area for the purposes of a minor residential unit, include: a. covered yards and areas covered by a roof but not enclosed by walls Exclude: a. decks and covered outdoor living spaces b. uncovered stairways; c. floor space in terraces (open or roofed), external balconies, breezeways or porches; d. car parking areas; and e. floor space of interior balconies and mezzanines not used by the public. ...	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that the terms yard and outdoor living space are both defined in the District Plan. I consider that the definitions provide sufficient guidance to enable "covered yards" and "covered outdoor living spaces" to be distinguished from each other when interpreting the standard. I therefore do not consider it necessary to amend the standard.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.8	S153.01.FS01	Landlink	GRZ-R6	Support primary submission	Agree with analysis and don't believe that measure should include covered yards. Note that minor residential dwellings make a modest yet important contribution to housing stock, minor flats may also become a more feasible housing focus.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S153	S153.02	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	GRZ-Rx5	Oppose	The matters of discretion includes "4. Cumulative Effects". For a restricted discretionary activity, we consider that 'cumulative effects' is too broad ranging and this give Council very broad scope to consider changes to any aspect of a proposal. Particularly for a rule that is considering bulk and location breaches for 1-3 units on a site. Such broad scope of discretion is not consistent with a restricted discretionary rule.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx5 as follows: <b>Matters of Discretion</b> <a href="#">1. The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design Guide in Appendix x1.</a> <a href="#">2. The matters contained in the Land Development Minimum Requirements.</a> <a href="#">3. Consideration of the effects of the standard not met.</a> <del>4. Cumulative effects.</del> <a href="#">5. The imposition of financial contributions in accordance with the Financial Contributions Chapter.</a>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree with the submitter. In any case, where cumulative effects are relevant to the breach of a density standard, these can be considered as part of the assessment of effects under sections 95E and 104(1)(a) of the RMA.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-Rx5. Refer section 4.28 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because provides for appropriately focussed matters of discretion, and avoid unnecessary duplication of a matter that is already provided for under the provisions of the RMA.
S202.FS.1	S153.02.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Rx5	Support primary submission	Agree with submitter that 'cumulative effects' is too broad as an assessment matter for a restricted discretionary activity. Aligns with the intent and relief sought in primary submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S153	S153.03	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	GRZ-Rx6	Oppose	The matters of discretion includes "4. Building density, form and appearance; 5. Streetscape; 7. Reverse Sensitivity; 8. Transport effects and 11 Cumulative effects". For a restricted discretionary activity, we consider that these issues are far too broad ranging and thus give Council very broad scope to consider changes to any aspect of a proposal. Particularly for a multi-unit development that complies with the bulk and location standards. Such broad scope of discretion is not consistent with a restricted discretionary rule.  We also consider that retaining discretion over "8. Transport effects" is not consistent with the intentions of the NPS-UD 2020. Policy 11(b) of the NPS-UD 2020 strongly encourages Council's to develop parking management plans, rather than assess off-site traffic and transport effects through resource consents.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx6 as follows: <b>Matters of Discretion</b> <a href="#">1. The matters contained in the Residential Design Guide in Appendix x1.</a> <a href="#">2. The matters contained in the Land Development Minimum Requirements.</a> <a href="#">3. Site layout.</a> <del>4. Building density, form and appearance.</del> <a href="#">5. Streetscape.</a> <a href="#">6. Landscaping.</a> <del>7. Reverse sensitivity.</del> <del>8. Transport effects.</del> <a href="#">9. Where the site is located adjacent to a Place and Area of Significance to Māori identified in Schedule 9, effects on cultural values.</a> <a href="#">10. Where the site is located adjacent to a site containing a historic heritage feature, effects on historic heritage values.</a> <del>11. Cumulative effects.</del> <a href="#">12. The imposition of financial contributions in accordance with the Financial Contributions Chapter.</a>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree with the submitter in relation to cumulative effects, for the reasons stated in my assessment under submission point S153.02.  I disagree with the submitter in relation to building density, form and appearance, reverse sensitivity and transport effects. I consider that these are all matters may be relevant to the consideration of effects of development with 4 or more residential units (which is beyond the level permitted by the MDRS, and to which the rule applies). In relation to transport effects, while I agree that policy 11(b) strongly encourages Councils to manage effects associated with the supply and demand of carparking through comprehensive management plans, this does not preclude Councils from considering these effects as part of a resource consent application.	<b>Accept in part.</b> By deleting "cumulative effects" from the list of matters of discretion.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-Rx6. Refer section 4.29 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because provides for appropriately focussed matters of discretion, and avoid unnecessary duplication of a matter that is already provided for under the provisions of the RMA.
S114.FS.1	S153.03.FS01	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited & Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	GRZ-Rx6	Oppose primary submission	The Fuel Companies oppose this submission point as it removes Council's discretion to assess reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities for developments involving the construction and use of more than three dwellings. The Fuel Companies acknowledge that consideration of reverse sensitivity effects are not appropriate in relation to the construction and use of up to three dwellings per site to enable greater housing supply in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS: UD) and Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). The Fuel Companies consider that higher density residential developments (i.e. more than three dwellings) have the potential to generate greater reverse sensitivity effects (e.g. noise) compared to, for example, an existing standalone dwelling. As such, the Fuel Companies consider that the consideration of reverse sensitivity effects is appropriate and will enable the ongoing operation of existing non-residential activities and result in better amenity outcomes for future residents. The consideration of reverse sensitivity matters is also consistent with the National Medium Density Design Guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) <sup>1</sup> .	Disallow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.8	S153.03.FS02	Landlink	GRZ-Rx7	Support primary submission	Support in part in relation to transport. Note transport effects should be approached cautiously given the permitted baseline of the MDRS and effects which will be potentially established through land use.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S153	S153.04	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose	Standard 2 refers to enhancement planting to create attractive features. Such a subjective requirement is not appropriate as a standard that determines compliance with a rule.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-DW-Rx1 as follows: ... <del>2. Existing waterways and stormwater detention areas must be retained, and be enhanced with plantings to create attractive features.</del> ...	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I agree with the submitter for the reasons stated in my assessment under submission point S028.36.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-DW-Rx1. Refer section 10.1 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to submission point S028.36.
S202.FS.1	S153.04.FS01	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-DW-Rx1	Support primary submission	Agree with submitter that the standard is too subjective and difficult to 'measure compliance against'. Aligns with the intent and relief sought in primary submission regarding that rules and standards should be non subjective and measurable for improved District Plan usability, implementation and compliance monitoring. Request KCDC consider more measuring standards for planting if they wish to retain this provision.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S153.04.FS02	Jonas, Malu	SUB-DW-Rx1	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission. PC2 treats vegetation as a mere down-graded 'amenity value', showing no cultural or health understanding for the need for nature near people's homes. It seems absolute tunnel-vision madness, to prioritise housing to such an extent, as to get rid of the very environmental qualities that enhance wellbeing (eg. Proximity to mature trees, mixed vegetation, view shafts to hills, sunlight) in the process.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S153	S153.05	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-DW-R23	Oppose	The non-complying activity status given to this rule presents a significant consenting barrier. As a matter of practice non-complying status should not be given to any rule lightly without significant justification as to why the activity should be discouraged. This extremely high status would seem disproportionate for a rule about subdivision not complying with servicing standards for water, sewage, stormwater or electricity and telecommunications.	<b>Change</b> the activity status of rule SUB-DW-R23 to have discretionary status.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	SUB-DW-R23 is the non-complying activity rule for subdivision where standards requiring the provision of water, wastewater, stormwater, or electricity and telecommunication infrastructure are not met. For the avoidance of doubt, I consider that SUB-DW-R23 is triggered when infrastructure is not provided to subdivided allotments (whereas servicing and engineering standards for the provision of infrastructure are addressed under the rules of the Infrastructure Chapter). The District Plan includes several policies that require the provision of (or appropriate connection to) infrastructure as part of subdivision, use and development (see policies INF-MENU-P17 - P21).  Because the District Plan sets clear expectations that development infrastructure is required to be provided as part of undertaking subdivision, I consider that non-complying activity status is appropriate and that amending the activity status to discretionary is not justified.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.8	S153.05.FS01	Landlink	SUB-DW-R23	Support primary submission	Non-complying status for subdivision which does not meet serving/infrastructure standards - does not need such a restrictive activity status as non-complying.	Allow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S153	S153.06	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-DW-R25	Oppose	We consider this rule to be flawed on a number of levels. While we would wish to see a 'boundary adjustment' rule, the standards and qualifying criteria are both significantly limiting and subjective such that the rule would have very little practical use.  Perhaps the rule is trying to cover too many possible options at once.	<b>Amend</b> the standards and terms as well as the qualifying criteria to be more clear.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	PC2 amends this rule to update cross references to other rules, but otherwise makes no substantial amendments to the rule. I consider the amendments requested by the submitter to be unclear, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S153	S153.07	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-R26	Oppose	Standard 1 refers to each lot having legal and physical access to a road. It is not necessary to include this matter as a standard, as it is a mandatory legislative requirement under section 106 RMA for all subdivisions.	Delete Standard 1 from SUB-RES-R26.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I disagree that this is a duplication of section 106 of the RMA. Section 106 only gives the Council discretion to decline consent for a controlled activity (or grant with conditions) in circumstances where there is not sufficient provision for legal and physical access.  Standard 1, while similarly worded, achieves a different function. The standard ensures that legal and physical access is provided as part of controlled activity subdivision (rather than simply making it open to the Council to decline the consent where access is not provided). The standard also has the effect of setting the activity status for subdivision where legal and physical access is not provided (which would become a discretionary activity under SUB-RES-R30). This enables the Council to consider the broader range of effects that may related to non-compliance with the standard on a case-by-case basis.  I also note that inclusion of this standard in the rule is consistent with the other rules in the District Plan that provide for subdivision across the District.	Do not accept.	No.
S153	S153.08	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-Rx1	Oppose	Standard 3 refers to each lot having legal and physical access to a road. It is not necessary to include this matter as a standard, as it is a mandatory legislative requirement under section 106 RMA for all subdivisions.	Delete Standard 3 from SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to my assessment under submission point S153.07.	Do not accept.	No.
S153	S153.09	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-Rx1	Oppose	Standard 5 requires compliance with SUB-RES-Table x1. However, the assessment of appropriate size and shape of a proposed lot is already addressed under Standards 1 & 2	Delete Standard 5 from SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Standards 1 and 2 provide a different function standard 5. Standards 1 and 2 ensure that subdivision can only occur as a controlled activity where it can be demonstrated that the land use rules for buildings in the General Residential Zone are be complied with on the parent allotment, or where there is land use consent (for contravening these rules).  Standard 5 addresses the specific matter of minimum allotment size and shapes (which in relation to subdivision under SUB-RES-Rx1, only apply to the creation of vacant allotments).	Do not accept.	No.
S153	S153.10	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-R26, SUB-RES-Rx1, Land Development Minimum Requirements	Oppose	These standards require access and services to be compliant with the Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements. Therefore making this external document a compliance standard. As such, we consider that this document (or at least the specific provisions) should be subject to submission as part of the plan change notification, rather than simply being incorporated as a reference document. We note that any future changes of this external document would not be incorporated into the District Plan until a plan change or variation proposal has been completed.  It is more appropriate that an assessment of the requirements of the Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements is a matter of control or discretion, rather than a consent standard.	Delete Standard 5 from SUB-RES-R26. Delete Standard 6 from SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Section 3.5.3 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report describes the consultation undertaken on the proposal to incorporate references to the LDMR into the District Plan, which includes the consultation required under clause 34 of Schedule 1 to the RMA.  The operative District Plan provides for the SDPR as a standard under the subdivision rules, and PC(N) does not propose to change this approach. I note that if this standard is not complied with, then subdivision would be a restricted discretionary activity under rule SUB-RES-R27, with the LDMR being a matter of discretion. For these reasons I do not consider it necessary or appropriate to delete the standards requested by the submitter.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.8	S153.10.FS01	Landlink	SUB-RES-R26, SUB-RES-Rx1, Land Development Minimum Requirements	Support primary submission	Believe further investigation into reference of SDPR2012/LDMR as a matter of discretion rather than a standard is a feasible consideration and potentially allows for more reasonable consideration of existing effects and innovate design solutions.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S153	S153.11	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose	Standard 3 refers to each lot having legal and physical access to a road. It is not necessary to include this matter as a standard, as it is a mandatory legislative requirement under section 106 RMA for all subdivisions.	Delete Standard 3 from SUB-RES-R27.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to my assessment under submission point S153.07.	Do not accept.	No.
S153	S153.12	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-R27	Oppose	Standard 4 requires compliance with SUB-RES-Table x1. However, the assessment of appropriate size and shape of a proposed lot is already- addressed under Standards 1 & 2.	Delete Standard 4 from SUB-RES-R27.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to my assessment under submission point S153.09.  In addition, I note that: - As applied under SUB-RES-R27, table SUB-RES-Table x1 provides for existing minimum allotment sizes and shapes to continue to apply in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct; - I have recommended that standards 1 and 2 under this rule are deleted in response to amendments to the rule cascade discussed in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S153	S153.13	Survey + Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose	The minimum lot area of 450m <sup>2</sup> and shape factor of an 18m circle for vacant lots in the general residential zone is not consistent with the NPS-UD's objectives of enabling as much development as possible.  The appropriate size and shape of an allotment should be able to be assessed by demonstrating compliance or that there is an associated land use consent.	Amend SUB-RES-Table x1 to provide for the following for vacant allotments. • Minimum lot area = 300m <sup>2</sup> ; • Shape factor = 14m diameter circle.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	While I consider that the minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor could be reduced to be more consistent with the MDRS, I am mindful that a vacant allotment, once subdivided, will enable the construction of 3 dwellings on that single vacant allotment as a permitted activity (not one). I is not clear to me from the information contained in the submission that a 300m <sup>2</sup> minimum allotment area is sufficient to accommodate 3 residential units.  I note that the Ministry for the Environment's Medium Density Residential Standards factsheet (see <a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf</a> ) illustrate three potential MDRS development outcomes each based on an approximate 420m <sup>2</sup> site area and a minimum site width of 13 metres. On this basis, I consider it appropriate to reduce the minimum vacant allotment size to 420m <sup>2</sup> and shape factor to 13 metres.  In any case, I note that: - There is no minimum allotment size or shape factor for allotments that have an approved land use consent (and this would include where land use consent is bundled with the subdivision consent); - In response to submission point S202.04, I have recommended that there be no minimum allotment size or shape factor where it can be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct residential units on the allotment that comply with rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 and GRZ-Rx3.	Accept in part. Amend the minimum vacant allotment area to 420m <sup>2</sup> and the minimum vacant allotment shape factor to 13 metres.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-Table x1. Refer to section 10.13 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor that is more consistent with the level of development anticipated by the MDRS.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S206.FS.8	S153.13.FS01	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Support primary submission	As per Landlink's primary submission - do not believe it is appropriate or conducive to the implementation of the NPS-UD to retain a 450m/18m diameter requirement for vacant lots. General advice (Quality Planning) outlines that 'the non-complying activity status is intended for situations where it is intended consents only be granted in exceptional circumstances'. Given the potential permitted baseline through land use retaining a non-complying activity status for subdivision which do not meet minimum 450m lot size or 15m diameter circle is overly restrictive and not conducive to implementation of the NPS-UD. Suggest a new minimum lot size is determined through analysis of size of lots that MDRH can be reasonably facilitated on - retention of 450m2 reflects older provisions of the District Plan which did not account for MDRH. Acknowledge this is a complex area and work may be constrained given short timeframes but a well considered new minimum lot size (if retention of a minimum lot size is considered appropriate) will likely lead to better urban design outcomes.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S153.13.FS02	Jonas, Malu	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose primary submission	Oppose this submission. This is even more likely to rob neighbouring properties of sun, and prevent neighbouring solar power generating systems from operating optimally. Seek an amendment that protects existing Solar Power production infrastructure, and actively encourages further solar power generating infrastructure in all new builds.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S154	S154.01	Sutherland, Bruce	General	Oppose	This submission opposes the provisions allowing for 3 storey buildings in existing residential zones.	Amend the provisions allowing 3 storey buildings in existing residential areas, to only allowing them in new residential zoned developments.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S154.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S155	S155.01	Cooper, Alison	234 & 254 Rangioru Road, Otaki	Not specified	This submission proposes amending the zoning of PR Lot 1 DP 42874 CT 19C/953 to General Residential Zone (PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B), for the following reasons: - It supports KCDC's strategic growth, given that it is located on the edge of land that has already been sold to developers and is included in the Proposed Plan Change; - It is able to aid in offsetting residential land demand shortfalls (as identified by KCDC's growth projections); - It will assist KCDC in meeting their statutory obligations under the NPS-UD 2020.	Amend the proposed rezoning of 234 and 254 Rangioru Road, Otaki to include PR Lot 1 DP 42874 CT 19C/953, to be included in the PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter requests their site which is directly adjacent to the rezoning proposed for 234 and 254 Rangioru Road as part of PC(N) be included and rezoned too.  I consider the site to be subject to the same constraints as the adjacent piece of land which was proposed to be rezoned as part of PC2. However, the site subject to the submission meets the definition of highly productive land under clause 3.5(7) of the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL). This is because the site itself was not subject to notified PC(N) at the commencement date of the NPS-HPL. I therefore consider it is inconsistent with Policy 5 of the NPS-HPL to include this site within the general residential zone.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S155.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	234 & 254 Rangioru Road, Otaki	Oppose primary submission	Moderate flood zone area. While NHO support the potential for housing in this site it is close to important waterways and requires special consideration for care of the taiao (including discharge). In addition, it is close to a kura who have raised concerns about residents overlooking the playground area. There is adequate provision in the DP for resource consents and requests for rezoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S156	S156.01	Richards, Luke	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Not specified	This submission proposes amending the zoning of 11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St (up to Bennetts Road) to Residential, for the following reasons: - It is directly adjacent to Residential zoned land; - It is near the town centre.	Rezone 11 and 15 Te Rauparaha St (up to Bennetts Road) to from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.	Submission deemed to be out of scope.
S245.FS.1	S156.01.FS01	Devery, Barbara	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	Fully support this submission, as it is the best use of the land. It is underutilised as occasional runoff for dairy cattle. This land is unsuitable for horticulture and will no longer be used for dairy. This block is close to amenities and walking distance to schools and collages. Residential development is very appropriate for this block.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S251.FS.1	S156.01.FS02	Dai, Karen	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	Support the rezoning of 11 and 15 Te Rauparaha Street to Residential. - It is directly adjacent to Residential Zoned land; - It is near the town centre; - Within walking distance of the local primary schools and secondary schools; - Churches around the area.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S253.FS.1	S156.01.FS03	Ngan, Jessica	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	Support the rezoning of 11 and 15 Te Rauparaha Street to Residential. - It is directly adjacent to Residential Zoned land; - It is near the town centre; - Within walking distance of the local primary schools and secondary schools; - Walking distance of shops.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S254.FS.1	S156.01.FS04	Huang, Nancy	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	Support the rezoning of 11 and 15 Te Rauparaha Street to Residential. - It is directly adjacent to Residential Zoned land; - It is near the town centre and shops; - Within walking distance of the local primary schools and secondary schools.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S156.FS.1	S156.01.FS05	Richards, Luke	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	Due to close proximity to town centre and amenities, combined with being adjacent to Residentially zoned land, it seems logical to extend this designation down to Bennetts Road. Population pressure is a huge factor in this consideration and this land has a far better use than it currently does.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S255.FS.1	S156.01.FS06	Dai, Guo	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	There is better use for this land. It is currently being used for vegetation growth, the soil is unfit for good quality vegetables and the production is low. The property itself is too close to residential zone to be used for growing veggies as there are often noise complaints and unable to use spray as it may pose a health issue for neighbours. Can be of much better use once zoned to Residential, as they are walking distance to the town centre, secondary school and churches present on same street.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S256.FS.1	S156.01.FS07	Kuishui	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	With the rising factor and concern of population increase, supporting the rezoning of this property is beneficial to both the town and the people. Close proximity to the town centre, shops, food, medical attention. Directly opposite residential zone and close proximity to secondary and primary schools, churches, and golf course.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S257.FS.1	S156.01.FS08	Wei, Bilan	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	- Soil on this property is unfit for vegetable growing. - Within walking distance of town centre. - Residential zone on other side of road. - Primary school and churches located on this street. - Farm is too close to residential activities.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S258.FS.1	S156.01.FS09	Thompson, Hannah	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	- Within walking distance to town centre. - Benefits the community. - Housing crisis.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S247.FS.1	S156.01.FS10	Xiong, Zhen	11 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Support primary submission	Housing pressure has been a key factor the past couple of years, and these two properties are located within walking distance of town, shops, restaurants, and churches.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S156.01.FS11	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	12 & 15 Te Rauparaha St, Otaki	Oppose primary submission	seriously flood zone area. Any effluent tanks or drains and pipes dug will hit water during the digging. Future climate change increases of precipitation will only exacerbate the situation. Untenable. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S157	S157.01	Crosbie-Caird, Dianna	60-222 Main South Road, Paraparaumu	Support	This submission supports Plan Change 2, for the following reasons: - The area has recently had an infrastructure upgrade ahead of the road changing to KCDC ownership; - It is a short and safe cycle to the train station, and within cycle/walking distance to the local primary schools and secondary schools; - A lot of the housing stock is late 70's/early or mid 80's on a 1/4 acre or larger section; - Replacing the existing housing with quality medium density (3 unit/3 storey) dwellings will improve the housing stock in the area and it is within a distance of the train station to encourage active transport/public transport use; - The upgraded stormwater and drinking water lines will also cope with an increase in dwellings.	Approve Plan Change 2 as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S157.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	60-222 Main South Road, Paraparaumu	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S158	S158.01	Thorn, Elizabeth	18 Huiawa Street, Waikanae	Oppose	This submission opposes the proposed rezoning 18 Huiawa Street from 'Open Space Private Recreation and Leisure' zone to 'Residential', for the following reasons: - The land was "vested in the Waikanae District and Progressive Ratepayers Association In, which was required to lease the land in perpetuity over 95 years ago" (see <a href="https://www.waikanaebeachbowls.com/444552672">https://www.waikanaebeachbowls.com/444552672</a> ); - It cannot be clearly established how this land came to be privately owned and on-sold; - Rezoning this land will break up PREC 35 into two parts; - Submitter does not think that the zoning on the other side of Huiawa Street and on the Lavinia Grove side does not justify breaking up the open space; - The community is an affected party and knows the best use of this land; - Waikanae beach is prone to flooding and is unsuitable for intensification. The Waimeha Stream and earlier the Waimea River ran through this land making it unsuitable for multi-level buildings due to proximity to sea level and poor ground conditions.	Reject the proposed rezoning 18 Huiawa Street from 'Open Space Private Recreation and Leisure' to 'Residential'.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter opposes the rezoning on the basis of disputes about historical vesting of the land, that matter is addressed by the owner of the land in their submission on PC(N) (Submitter S026). The ownership of the land is not a decisive consideration in relation to the zoning of the site, and is not relevant. If it is considered that there are issues related to the ownership of the land, then this is a matter most appropriately addressed outside of the District Plan. While the site is zoned Open Space, it is privately owned and does not provide open space for public use. Issues relating to potential hazards on site are managed through the Operative District Plan provisions for flood hazards.	Do not accept.	No.
S159	S159.01	Quentin Poole - Trustee	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not fully satisfy a range of policies in the NZCPS, whereas the Coastal Environment, as defined in the operative District Plan, does; - The s32 report does not fully comply with the NZCPS 2010. - Because the Operative District Plan is not compliant with NZCPS 2010, the area defined within the Coastal Environment must become the status quo.	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct whose landward boundary is the landward boundary of the area shown as the "Coastal Environment" in the District Plan. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S159.01.FS01	Nga Hapu o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond the narrow strip of coastal margin and that the current proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is insufficient. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zone areas subject to coastal hazards in the future. We recommend the Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S159	S159.02	Quentin Poole - Trustee	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	This approach better satisfies Policies 1, 6, 13, 14 and 19 contained within NZCPS 2010, whereas none of these policies are fully satisfied by the area currently defined as the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (CQMP).	Alternatively to submission point S159.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kapiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S159	S159.03	Quentin Poole - Trustee	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements".	Amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S159	S159.04	Quentin Poole - Trustee	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The use of the Jacobs V2 lines to develop the CQMPs is not required by, and is inconsistent with clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020. - It is inappropriate to use the Jacobs report as a means to circumvent the required plan change that the Council has to promote on the Coastal Environment. It is an incomplete assessment and one that has not been subject to appropriate scrutiny.	Delete all evidence derived from the incorrect use of Jacobs V1 & V2. Amend S32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within Jacobs V1 & V2. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to section 4.11.1 of the body of the report for discussion on the use of the Jacobs Assessment as part of PC2.  I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	Do not accept.	No.
S159	S159.05	Quentin Poole - Trustee	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements". - The guidance does not correctly state the law that it is telling councils how to administer.	Delete all evidence derived from the incorrect use of MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. Amend s32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	Do not accept.	No.
S160	S160.01	Gomez, Nancy	Walkable catchments	Oppose	The level of commercial activities in the Local Centres (e.g. Mazengarb and Waikanae Beach) is too low to justify 4-storey buildings within a General Residential Zone 200m walkable catchment.	Amend walkable catchments to be as follows for General Residential Zone: a) Within an 800m walkable catchment of the edge of the Metropolitan Centre Zone - applicable to GRZ in Paraparaumu: This must be reduced from 800m walkable catchment to 400m.  b) Within an 800m walkable catchment of a rapid transit stop - applicable from Waikanae station, Paraparaumu station, Paekākāriki station: Keep this walkable catchment as it is 800m.  c) Within a 400m walkable catchment of the Town Centre Zone - applicable to GRZ in Otaki Main Street, Otaki Railway, Paraparaumu Beach, Raumati Beach: This must be reduced from 400m walkable catchment to 200m.  d) Within a 200m walkable catchment of the Local Centre Zone - applicable to GRZ in Waikanae Beach, Kena Kena, Mazengarb Road, Meadows, Raumati South: This must be reduced from 200m walkable catchment to 100m.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	In relation to the request under (a), I consider this would be inconsistent with the requirement for the District Plan to give effect to Policy 3(c) in relation to the Metropolitan Centre Zone. I note that Ministry for the Environment guidance on implementing the intensification provisions of the NPS-UD considers 800 metres to be the minimum size walkable catchment for use by Tier 1 local authorities implementing Policy 3(c) (see Ministry for the Environment (2020), <i>Understanding and implementing intensification provisions for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development</i> , pp.23-24).  In relation to the requests under (c) and (d), I consider that the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B within 400 metres of the Town Centre Zone and 200 metres of the Local Centre Zone is consistent with level of commercial activities and community services provided for by the District Plan in these zones, and consistent with the position and function of these zones within the District's centres hierarchy. On the basis that I consider that the size of the precinct appropriately gives effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, I do not consider reducing the size of these precincts to be justified.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S160	S160.02	Gomez, Nancy	UFD-Px	Oppose	Kapiti Coast is of a small geographic size and has beach village character, higher density up to 12 storeys is not justifiable and will mean that the Kapiti community will lose its special character and charm. Also, sites subject to a qualifying matter should not benefit from the intensification rules.	<b>Amend</b> policy UFD-Px as follows: <u>Provide for heights and densities of urban built form that enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, the District's urban environments, by:</u>  1. <u>enabling the greatest building heights and densities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, including buildings up to 127 storeys;</u> 2. <u>enabling greater building heights and densities within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and the train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae, including buildings up to 6 storeys;</u> 3. <u>enabling greater building heights and densities in the Town Centre Zone, including buildings up to 65 storeys;</u> 4. <u>enabling increased building heights and densities in the Local Centre Zone, including buildings up to 4 storeys;</u> 5. <u>enabling increased building heights and densities adjacent to the Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone, including buildings up to 4 storeys; and</u> 6. <u>enabling a variety of building heights and densities in the General Residential Zone, including buildings up to 3 storeys;</u>  <u>while avoiding inappropriate buildings, activities, heights and densities within sites subject to qualifying matters-areas.</u>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While the amendments to building heights requested by the submitter are not inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, they are inconsistent with <i>Te tuhu pai</i> (the District Growth Strategy), which seeks that building heights up to 12-storeys are enabled in the Metropolitan Centre Zone and building heights up to 6-storeys are enabled in the Town Centre Zone. I therefore do not consider it appropriate to amend the building heights enabled by the policy in the manner requested by the submitter.  I generally agree with the submitter that, in areas subject to a qualifying matter, it may not be appropriate to enable increased building heights and densities. However, the extent to which this is the case will depend on the provisions related to the specific qualifying matter. In response to submission point S207.03, I have recommended that the wording of the final sentence be amended to read: "while recognising it may be appropriate to be less enabling of development to accommodate an identified qualifying matter". I consider this wording appropriately provides for consideration of whether it is appropriate to the height and density otherwise provided for by UFD-Px in relation to a qualifying matter.	Do not accept.	No.
S160	S160.03	Gomez, Nancy	UFD-Px	Oppose	See submission point S160.02.	<b>Amend</b> any consequential changes to rules created by amendments to UFD-Px (under submission point S160.02).	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that my recommendations under submission point S160.02 require any consequential amendments.	Do not accept.	No.
S160	S160.04	Gomez, Nancy	DO-Ox3	Oppose	For the number of precincts be increased to reflect the intensification allowed in the revised walkable catchment areas and revised heights mentioned in submission points S160.01 and S160.02.	<b>Amend</b> the number of precincts referred to in DO-Ox3 to give effect to submission points S160.01 and S160.02. <b>Amend</b> precinct labels across all documents and plans to a consistent labelling as they are confusing (e.g. Precinct A = PREC1x)	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that my recommendations under submission point S160.02 require any consequential amendments to DO-Ox3.  In relation to the numbering of precincts, I consider that proposed precincts have been consistently numbered in accordance with the National Planning Standards. I note that when PC2 becomes operative, new precincts will be renumbered to adopt the next consecutive number following on from the last operative precinct number.	Do not accept.	No.
S160	S160.05	Gomez, Nancy	DO-Ox3	Oppose	See submission point S160.04.	<b>Amend</b> any consequential changes to rules created by amendments to DO-Ox3.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not recommend any amendments to DO-Ox3, and therefore do not consider that any consequential amendments are necessary.	Do not accept.	No.
S160	S160.06	Gomez, Nancy	General Residential Zone	Not specified	No specific reasons given.	<b>Amend</b> the rules for the General Residential Zone so that any breach in height is a non-complying activity.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested by the submitter is inconsistent with the requirements of clause 4 of Schedule 3A to the RMA, which requires that the construction of residential units that breach permitted activity standards (such as height) is a restricted discretionary activity.	Do not accept.	No.
S160.FS.03	S160.FS.01	Gomez, Nancy	Full submission	Support primary submission	The submitter agrees with the points raised in the submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	DO-O3	Oppose	The submission opposes this amendment because whilst the Objective is amended to say: "...and to provide for the development of new urban areas where these can be efficiently serviced and integrated with existing townships, delivering..." Clauses 1-10 do not refer to securing available three waters infrastructure and assumes that planned infrastructure could provide for the management of expected development. This means that development proposals will be provided for in the absence of such infrastructure.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O3 to refer to "securing available three waters infrastructure".	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S161.01.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa seek several amendments to ensure that development occurs in areas where three water infrastructure is available with sufficient capacity to cater for that additional demand. Greater Wellington also seek to ensure that development occurs where it can be appropriately served by three waters infrastructure and that infrastructure is planned and provided for in an integrated manner either ahead of, or when development occurs.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	DO-O3	Oppose	The submission opposes Clause 6 on the basis it is now written in a manner that waters down character and amenity values which further waters down the inherent cultural and indigenous components of these special values. <i>Giving regard</i> to is passive instead of maintaining and enhancing. In the absence of strong evidence, the Runanga is concerned that the protection of these values can be diminished by giving regard to instead of maintaining and/or enhancing.	<b>Amend</b> clause 6 (formerly clause 5) of DO-O3 to replace "has regard to" with "maintains and/or enhances".	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S161.02.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa raise concerns over amendments that reduce the level of protection or maintenance of amenity values which include cultural values. Ngāti Toa seek that the proposed language which weakens the level of protection for amenity values is amended to ensure those values are actively maintained and not just considered but recognised and provided for. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of Mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(3) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values are pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	DO-O3	Oppose	The submission opposes Clause 10 for having a policy intention that diminishes the Council's role in responding to Climate Change. It suggests instead of Council 'supporting reductions', the land use should reduce the emissions by way of introducing Standards in the Plan.	<b>Amend</b> the objective to require that land use reduce emissions by way of introducing standards to the Plan.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I note the wording of clause 10 is consistent with the wording of Objective 8 of the NPS-UD, and I consider it to be appropriate on this basis. I also do not consider it appropriate for district rules to regulate reductions in emissions, as I consider this to be principally a function of regional councils under section 30(f) of the RMA.	Do not accept.	No.
S206.FS.12	S161.03.FS01	Landlink	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Agree that the Plan Change requires more focus and commitment to climate change issues and sustainable development to give full effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Not specified	The Rūnanga is concerned whilst the amended parts of the Local Issues Section do acknowledge the district plan should <i>enable more people to live in Kāpiti where these are well connected to transport, infrastructure, commercial activities and community services</i> , it does not acknowledge these are not available and match the development levels NPS-UD is seeking. The section could be rewritten to <i>ensure that more people can only live in Kāpiti if there is adequate infrastructure and transport</i> . It is within our existing knowledge that the region is not yet well-connected to infrastructure and transport.	<b>Amend</b> the "Local Issues" section of the explanatory text to DO-O3 to ensure that more people can only live in Kāpiti if there is adequate infrastructure and transport.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S161.04.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-03 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa seek several amendments to ensure that development occurs in areas where three water infrastructure is available with sufficient capacity to cater for that additional demand. Greater Wellington also seek to ensure that development occurs where it can be appropriately served by three waters infrastructure and that infrastructure is planned and provided for in an integrated manner either ahead of, or when development occurs.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.12	S161.04.FS02	Landlink	DO-03 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Agree that the Plan Change requires more focus and commitment to climate change issues and sustainable development to give full effect to the NPS-UD and note environmental wellbeing is an important element to consider in relation to objective.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.04.FS03	Jonas, Malu	DO-03 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-03 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The Rūnanga is concerned that the proposed amendments removed the word 'preservation' and replaced it with 'recognition'. There is not enough evidence to water down the protection vested in the Operative Plan. Since one does suggest 'active action' and the other encourages 'doing nothing', it is concerning a planning problem is removed without contemplating the resource management issue at hand.	Reject the proposed replacement of "preservation" with "recognition" in the "Local Issues" section of the explanatory text to DO-03.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.06	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-Ox1	Oppose	The submission opposes the wording of this new Objective because it is fundamentally flawed. The new wording does not speak to environmental wellbeing, whereas all the other wellbeings mentioned in the Objective social, economic and cultural wellbeing cannot exist without the environmental wellbeing, te ora mo te taiao (the wellbeing of the environment).	Amend DO-Ox1 to add environmental wellbeing and / or amend objective to reflect the environmental wellbeing.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S161.06.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-Ox1	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.07	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-Ox2	Support in part	The submission partially supports this objective but notes that it somewhat fails to recognise that housing variety and choice are limited even more so for iwi and members of Tangata Whenua, and that housing choice and variety do not reflect the housing aspirations of Tangata Whenua.	Amend DO-Ox2 to recognise that the housing variety and choice are limited even more so for iwi and members of Tangata Whenua, and that housing choice and variety do not reflect the housing aspirations of Tangata Whenua.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.08	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-Ox2	Support in part	See submission point S161.07.	Amend PC2 to specify where objective DO-Ox2 applies (which should include the Papakāinga chapter and the zones that it applies to).	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.  I note that DO-Ox2 is required to apply to relevant residential zones, which in the Kapiti Coast District Plan is the General Residential Zone. This is provided for in section 1.18 of the IPI.  I do not consider it necessary to apply DO-Ox2 to the Papakāinga chapter, because DO-Ox2 is specific to the General Residential Zone, whereas the Papakāinga chapter applies to multiple zones. I also consider that the objectives outlined in the Papakāinga chapter seek a broadly similar outcome in terms of enabling housing types, sizes and built character that responds to the needs and demands of tangata whenua.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.09	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-Ox3	Oppose	The submission states that DO-Ox3 purely gives effect to increased height and density within the parts of the General Residential Zone but fails to speak and link into Papakāinga and Tangata Whenua aspirations into the future. It does not account for the impacts on the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.  The objection raised by the submission includes the objective being unable to cater for changing land use for Tangata Whenua when they receive land back through Settlement arrangements; the objective will be simply overtaking the rights and interests of Tangata Whenua by overlaying a 'residential intensification precinct' without Tangata Whenua involvement.	Amend DO-Ox3 to ensure Tangata Whenua's role in the residential intensification precinct (including Papakāinga).	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.10	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-O11	Oppose	The submission states that the proposed amendment to DO-O11 provides a watered down version of the values proposed to be protected in the first place. The phrases of character and amenity are muddled through although they represent different values in urban environment.  The submission opposes that character and amenity values won't be maintained and enhanced but just recognised. Character and amenity values have significant cultural and indigenous components, but they are not referenced in clauses 1-5. For instance, presence of mature vegetation can also be a cultural heritage.	Amend DO-O11 to replace "recognise" with "maintain and enhance".	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S161.10.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O11	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa raise concerns over amendments that reduce the level of protection or maintenance of amenity values which include cultural values. Ngāti Toa seek that the proposed language which weakens the level of protection for amenity values is amended to ensure those values are actively maintained and not just considered but recognised and provided for. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of Mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(3) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values are pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.11	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission includes detailed reasoning, including (but not limited to) that: - the explanatory text does not recognise or reflect tangata whenua values; - emphasising that "amenity values develop and change over time" does not recognise that amenity values also cover cultural and religious identities that come from the past.	Reject amendments to DO-O11 that would have the effect of downgrading protection for iwi-related values (such as the cultural aspects of character and amenity values). Amend the explanatory text to DO-O11 by re-writing it with Tangata Whenua.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the explanatory text to DO-O11, as noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to review this text as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S161.11.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa raise concerns over amendments that reduce the level of protection or maintenance of amenity values which include cultural values. Ngāti Toa seek that the proposed language which weakens the level of protection for amenity values is amended to ensure those values are actively maintained and not just considered but recognised and provided for. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of Mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(3) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values are pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.12	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission is concerned that it is acknowledged 'while a lack of reticulated infrastructure may constrain levels of development in the short-term, access to reticulated infrastructure to support existing and new development in the area may need to be considered over the long term'. This should not be a 'may' but 'must' as the submitter is aware the three waters infrastructure is not fit for this purpose.	Amend the statement within the explanatory text to DO-O11 as follows: <u>While a lack of reticulated infrastructure may constrain levels of development in the short-term, access to reticulated infrastructure to support existing and new development in the area may need to must be considered over the long-term.</u>	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	I agree with the submitter, but for different reasons. Specifically, the requirement under the NPS-UD to provide sufficient development capacity that is infrastructure-ready (outlined under clauses 3.3 and 3.4 of the NPS-UD) creates an obligation on the Council to consider the availability of infrastructure to support development over the long term.	Accept.	Yes. Amend the explanatory text to DO-O11 (refer section 1.12 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it more appropriately reflects the Council's obligations under the NPS-UD.
S097.FS.1	S161.12.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa seek several amendments to ensure that development occurs in areas where three water infrastructure is available with sufficient capacity to cater for that additional demand. Greater Wellington also seek to ensure that development occurs where it can be appropriately served by three waters infrastructure and that infrastructure is planned and provided for in an integrated manner either ahead of, or when development occurs.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.12.FS02	Jonas, Malu	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.13	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-O16	Oppose	The submission opposes the amendments to the wording of this objective on the basis that whilst it is amended to cater for 'providing for higher density urban built character and high-quality development in Metropolitan and town centre zones' the submitter is not assured that the environmental quality is provided for.	Amend DO-O16 to include an objective that the environment is provided for as part of proposals and that the environment must not be worse off.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that DO-O16 already seeks that a range of positive environmental outcomes are provided for within the District's centres. I do not consider that it would be appropriate to amend DO-O16 to require in general terms that the environment must not be worse off, as it implies that any adverse effect on the environment would be unacceptable. I consider this may be overly restrictive in that it does not leave room for an assessment of whether the adverse effects associated with development are reasonable.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S161.13.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-O16	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.14	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-O16 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission identifies that the centres hierarchy could impact on the aspirations of Tangata Whenua and bringing these aspirations to fruition by way of dictating densities and heights at sites that are not appropriate.  The submission identifies that decisions to 'up zone' certain areas have flowed from the Centres Hierarchy, and that this will lead to visual and physical change in the hierarchy over time.  The submission states that it seems to have been left to Council's discretion as to how they arrange the centres in the hierarchy. The submission identifies that they way walkable catchments have been applied to centres appears to be arbitrary, and in breach of the centres hierarchy. Paekākāriki is an example of this.	Amend the explanatory text to DO-O16 to avoid the centres hierarchy being used as a barrier to: a. developing their own housing and land development aspirations (for instance, papakāinga, education etc.); b. implement and express their cultural practices; or c. implementing Tino Rangāiratanga.	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.15	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	DO-Ox4, DO-Ox5, DO-Ox6, DO-Ox7, DO-Ox8, DO-Ox9, DO-Ox10	Support	The submission supports the Papakāinga objectives.	Retain the proposed papakāinga objectives as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S161	S161.16	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	Metropolitan Centre Zone	Not specified	The submission seeks that papakāinga are enabled in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Amend Plan Change 2 to enable papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	Yes. Add three new rules (MCZ-Rx1, MCZ-Rx2 and MCZ-Rx3) to the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 5.11 of PC2(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S161.16.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Metropolitan Centre Zone	Support primary submission	The submitter seeks for Plan Change 2 to enable papakāinga in the Metropolitan Centre Zone. Greater Wellington support provisions that would enable the development of papakāinga as this has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy UD.2.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161	S161.17	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	Definition: ANCESTRAL LAND	Not specified	The submission seeks the definition of "ancestral land" be amended to be a more enriched version of the current proposed version.	<b>Amend</b> the proposed definition of ANCESTRAL LAND to the following definition:  <a href="#">Ancestral Land means land where tangata whenua have an undisturbed collective whakapapa relationship.</a>	4.3 Papakāinga	Section 32 Evaluation Report (p.67), notes that the definition of the term "ancestral land" used in PC2 is intentionally broad, and based on interpretation of the term developed through case law. The intention of this is to avoid the District Plan being overly prescriptive about what the term means, to allow tangata whenua sufficient scope to appropriately define their specific relationship to the land in the circumstances of the case. I acknowledge that whakapapa is a core component of the relationship between tangata whenua and ancestral whenua, and I note that whakapapa, in relation to ancestral land that is general title land, is acknowledged in policy PK-Px1.  I am concerned that use of the term "undisturbed" in the definition requested by the submitter may be interpreted in a manner that rules out land that had been alienated in the past, but has since been reacquired by tangata whenua, from being considered as ancestral land. I am concerned that, where it is interpreted in this manner, this may make it more challenging for tangata whenua to obtain resource consent to develop papakāinga development on general title land that they may have lost in the past, but since reacquired, and I consider this would be inconsistent with objective DO-X4 (which seeks to enable tangata whenua to live on their ancestral land).  I make this recommendation cautiously, mindful that I interpret this issue from the perspective of a Pākehā practitioner, and mindful that I have not been able to discuss this matter with Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira. The submitter may wish to express their position on this matter at the hearing.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S161.17.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Definition: ANCESTRAL LAND	Support primary submission	Submitter seeks the definition of ancestral land is amended. Greater Wellington support the proposed definition.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.18	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	UDF-Px	Not specified	The submission identifies that the term "urban form" is used to describe a city's physical characteristics. It refers to the size, shape, and configuration of an urban area or its parts. The submitter seek that this is amended to reflect Tangata Whenua visibility, influence, and presence, of how developments look and feel.  The submission identifies that urban built form is a Pakeha construct, and it should not mean just height and density; this is a narrow way of describing urban built form. This chapter only refers to and focuses on heights and densities in certain zones.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-Px to say whether the height and densities deliver for existing and historical development patterns, appearance and sites of significance, degree of enclosure to the street exhibit (relationship with the building height and street width), public realm being activated, pedestrian activity, significant landmarks and gateways for cultural purposes and how they are presented.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	While I acknowledge the matter raised by the submitter in relation to reflecting tangata whenua visibility, influence and presence in relation to the built form of development, I consider the amendments to the policy sought by the submitter to be unclear.  I note that it is not the intent of UFD-Px to match building heights and densities to existing historical development patterns. On the contrary, it is intended to enable development patterns that are consistent with the levels of development required by the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S161	S161.19	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	UDF-Px	Support	The submission supports the usage of language "avoiding" inappropriate heights and densities within sites of significance which is a qualifying matter.	<b>Retain</b> the use of "avoiding" in the final sentence of UFD-Px.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I note that I have recommended that the word "avoid" be removed from this policy in response to submission point S207.03. I have made this recommendation on the basis that because each identified qualifying matter is subject to its own specific policies, there is a risk that the term "avoid" used in this policy may be seen to arbitrarily override those specific policies.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S161	S161.20	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	UFD-P1	Not specified	The submission notes that where infrastructure is a barrier, it is a barrier for suggested, promoted, and encouraged density and heights of housing development as well. Clauses 5 and 6 need to be stronger to mean that strategic infrastructure should be available and housing development should not just promote the efficient use of energy and water, it should be energy and water efficient.	<b>Amend</b> clause 5 of UFD-P1 to require that infrastructure is available.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S161.20.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa seek several amendments to ensure that development occurs in areas where three water infrastructure is available with sufficient capacity to cater for that additional demand. Greater Wellington also seek to ensure that development occurs where it can be appropriately served by three waters infrastructure and that infrastructure is planned and provided for in an integrated manner either ahead of, or when development occurs.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.20.FS02	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.21	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	UFD-P1	Not specified	See submission point S161.20.	<b>Amend</b> clause 6 of UFD-P1 to require housing development is energy and water efficient.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider 'promote' is more appropriate than 'require' because of the general nature of this policy. I note that policy INF-MENU-P19 requires water tanks, water reuse systems or other forms of water demand management to be provided as part of new residential development. While I consider that the energy efficiency of new buildings is principally regulated under the Building Act 2004 (through clause H1 of the Building Code), I also note that a range of energy efficiency measures are encouraged under policy INF-GEN-P12.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S161.21.FS01	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P1	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.22	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	UFD-P2	Not specified	The submissions states that this policy should emphasize the impact of Climate Change and housing affordability. As housing affordability and particularly the housing market defines the housing choice, we will see more sprawl between the regions and cities.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P2 to specify that housing choices will be carefully considered as per their impact on Climate Change in our region and applications will be assessed on this merit.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	UFD-P2 seeks to increase housing variety and choice across the District. I do not consider it appropriate to include direction to consider potential impacts on climate change as part of this policy, as this is not a matter that is intended to be managed by this policy.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.12	S161.22.FS01	Landlink	UFD-P2	Support primary submission	Agree that the Plan Change requires more focus and commitment to climate change issues and sustainable development to give full effect to the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.22.FS02	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P2	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.23	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	UFD-P2	Not specified	The submission is concerned that dropping a level down of the 'amenity values' should not be necessarily the victim of the housing problems. District Plan still needs to deliver for the amenity values regardless of accommodating different housing choices. We are in essence in support of District Plan catering for different layers of housing choices, but this should not be done in a way that deteriorates Amenity Values.	<b>Reject</b> the proposed change of wording in UFD-P2 from "maintaining" to "encouraging" high amenity values.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S097.FS.1	S161.23.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P2	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa raise concerns over amendments that reduce the level of protection or maintenance of amenity values which include cultural values. Ngāti Toa seek that the proposed language which weakens the level of protection for amenity values is amended to ensure those values are actively maintained and not just considered but recognised and provided for. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of Mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(3) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values are pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.23.FS02	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P2	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.24	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	UFD-P3	Not specified	The submission is concerned that residential intensification will 'only' give consideration to the effects of subdivision and development on character and amenity values. The submission is concerned some of these values have embedded cultural components and are part of sites and areas of significance and culturally sensitive areas.  The submission states that in this instance, 'giving consideration' is not good enough. This Policy should be recrafted to say: residential intensification will give special regard to significant impacts of the subdivision and development on character and amenity especially when it interacts with Tangata Whenua values. When this is the case, the applicant should engage with Tangata Whenua to avoid the impacts and work on a better solution for Tangata Whenua.	Amend policy UFD-P3 as follows:  <u>Residential intensification will give consideration special regard to the significant impacts of the subdivision and development on character and amenity values where these are provided for in the District Plan especially when it interacts with Tangata Whenua values.</u>	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S161.24.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P3	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa raise concerns over amendments that reduce the level of protection or maintenance of amenity values which include cultural values. Ngāti Toa seek that the proposed language which weakens the level of protection for amenity values is amended to ensure those values are actively maintained and not just considered but recognised and provided for. The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of Mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e). Greater Wellington seeks that amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(3) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values are pursued.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.24.FS02	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P3	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.25	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	UFD-P4	Not specified	The submission expresses concern that amendments to this policy cater for 'high densities' in specified zones but Clause 5 is mostly deleted and recrafted to say the residential densities will be integrated with existing or planned infrastructure capacity.  The submission states that this would allow higher densities, potentially in the absence of infrastructure being provided or available. Since 'infrastructure' is not a qualifying matter, this is a big concern for Tangata Whenua.	Reject amendments to UFD-P4 that allow higher densities in the absence of infrastructure being provided or available.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S097.FS.1	S161.25.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	UFD-P4	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa seek several amendments to ensure that development occurs in areas where three water infrastructure is available with sufficient capacity to cater for that additional demand. Greater Wellington also seek to ensure that development occurs where it can be appropriately served by three waters infrastructure and that infrastructure is planned and provided for in an integrated manner either ahead of, or when development occurs.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.25.FS02	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P4	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.26	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	UFD-P11	Oppose	The submission opposes clause 2 that reinserts 'considers effects on the amenity values of those areas while recognising that the district'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'.  The submissions states that this creates an excuse to acknowledge the change across the city, but it is recrafted to mean amenity might not be provided for.	Reject the proposed amendments to UFD-P11.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S161.26.FS01	Jonas, Malu	UFD-P11	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.27	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	UFD-P13	Not specified	The submission notes that it is problematic that the Zoning Framework may not respond to Tangata Whenua needs as Residential Intensification is listed as a qualifying matter. This matter becomes more problematic when we consider the unforeseen impacts of the residential intensification on Sites and Areas of Significance and Tangata Whenua Resource Management.	Amend the policy to require that all residential assessment is assessed from a cultural perspective.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that requiring all residential development to be assessed from a cultural perspective would be onerous in circumstances where effects on cultural values are not relevant to development.  I note that where effects on cultural values are relevant to a residential development that requires resource consent under rules GRZ-Rx5, GRZ-Rx6, GRZ-Rx7 or GRZ-Rx8, the effects on cultural values are able to be assessed under the relevant matters of discretion, and where a cultural impact assessment is necessary to appropriately assess the effects on cultural values, it is open to the Council to request the applicant provide one, or for the Council to have one commissioned.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161	S161.28	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Papakāinga chapter	Support	The submission notes that Tangata Whenua were heavily involved in the drafting the papakāinga provisions. The submission supports the chapter as a whole and that it is enabled in different zones.	Retain the proposed Papakāinga chapter as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	I agree with the submitter, but note recommendations to amend parts of the chapter in response to other submissions.	Accept in part. Noting recommendations to amend this provision in response to other submissions.	No.
S161	S161.29	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Design Guides	Not specified	The submission is concerned that General Residential Zone leaves appearance and amenity of neighbourhood changes to Design Guides which are expected to manage the impacts of medium density and high-density developments.  The submitter is not convinced a non-binding document that developers can push back on because they might want to cut off their costs could achieve a high standard of urban design and just to 'encourage' new development 'contribute' positively to the changing character of the zone.	Amend the provisions of the General Residential Zone to strengthen requirements to achieve a high standard of urban design.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that <i>encouraging</i> high-quality urban design (or high-quality development, as specified under policy GRZ-Px5) to be appropriate, because this is consistent with the mandatory MDRS policy outlined under clause 6(e) of Schedule 3A of the RMA.  On this basis, I consider the provisions of the General Residential Zone that seek to encourage high-quality design and development have an appropriate level of strength.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.30	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Not specified	The submission raises several concerns in simply following the rapid transit stops definition to determine Residential Intensification Precinct A, as this creates zoning which may not be appropriate to implement. In particular the following matters of concern are noted: - the impacts of climate change; - lack of infrastructure; - high character values in specific precincts.  The submission also notes that in the Whanganui-a-Tara Johnsonville Catchment, the Johnsonville line did not pass for a rapid transit service, and in Auckland a lack of infrastructure has been regarded as a qualifying matter.	Amend provisions relating to Residential Intensification Precinct A to ensure the location and extent of intensification precincts are appropriate given climate change, infrastructure constraints and the presence of high character values.	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S161.30.FS01	Jonas, Malu	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Important to safeguard cultural/environmental qualities.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.31	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	GRZ-Px2	Oppose	The submission notes that all five policies are incorporated to give effect to Medium Density Residential Standards and a central government requirement. The submitter considers that in general, these policies are seeking objectives that are not well considered and may align poorly in practice. The submission is particularly concerned about policy GRZ-Px2.  The submission opposes the wording of 'relevant' in the drafting of GRZ-PX2 as this dilutes the provisions for sites of significance (and adjacent sites) where the MDRS apply. The submission questions who would decide what "relevant" means when processing such resource consents?	Amend GRZ-Px2 to remove the word "relevant".	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.32	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px2, GRZ-Px3, GRZ-Px4, GRZ-Px5	Not specified	The submission notes that all five policies are incorporated to give effect to Medium Density Residential Standards and a central government requirement. The submitter considers that in general, these policies are seeking objectives that are not well considered and may align poorly in practice.  The submission notes that GRZ-PX5 conflicts in the sense that it encourages acceptance of a scenario that does not add up to permitted activity by encouraging high quality development. The submission identifies that this risks blindly accepting an activity that is not permitted and is restricted discretionary otherwise.  The submission notes that it is encouraging to see where there can be high and medium densities, streets are safe and attractive, there are adequate open spaces, and the developments meet the needs of residents' daily needs. The submitter is not sure or assured how these are delivered through the standards and methods. The policies should highlight and refer to the methods that could achieve that, and they will be considered by the resource consent planners.	Amend the policies to highlight and refer to the methods to achieve the policies, and that they will be considered by the resource consent planners.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S161	S161.33	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	GRZ-Px6	Oppose	The submission states that there is uncertainty as the scale and scope of the Residential Intensification Precincts, and their impacts on sites of significance. The submission notes that these areas have been identified in a quick manner with limited research and impact analysis for Tangata Whenua, and because the Residential Design Guide does not reflect Tangata Whenua values at this point in time, the submitter does not have confidence that the policy will deliver on how spaces and places look and feel.	Amend the scale and scope of the Residential Intensification Precincts to provide for impacts on sites of significance and Tangata Whenua values.	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together on a broader review of sites and areas of significance to Māori as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S161	S161.34	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Not specified	The submission identifies that there is a sentiment in the drafting intention, that in the future, a formulated environment plan could change the nature of how this precinct is defined and may even be removed as an overlay.  The submission identifies that it is astonishing to see GRZ-R6 rule as a permitted activity; the standards attached to this rule are permissive in terms of the maximum number of residential units. This does not seem to encourage less buildings and structures but seems to introduce more complexity in the coastal qualifying matter district.  The submission notes that this allows up to four residential units may be erected on-site provided that they can meet the standards of containment, separation by distance, permitted activity standards, and provided that financial contributions were made.	Amend the provisions associated with the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to reflect climate change and sea level rise, and to strengthen the fact that is why less development is needed in the District.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	As stated in the Section 32 Evaluation Report, the purpose of the precinct is "to maintain the status quo level of development enabled by the provisions of the operative District Plan in the relevant area, to ensure that the management of coastal hazards can be appropriately addressed through the future coastal environment plan change process". Retaining rule GRZ-R6 as a permitted activity is consistent with this purpose. While this allows for the construction of up to 4 dwellings on allotment, this is only the case where these dwellings can fit on the site in a manner that complies with the subdivision standards under SUB-RES-R27 (which are also retained for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct). This approach is consistent with retaining the status quo level of development, and I therefore do not consider the amendments requested are necessary.  I consider that any more restrictive provisions in relation to the development of coastal areas are more appropriately addressed as a part of the Council's future coastal environment plan change.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203.FS.1	S161.34.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	Agree that the reference to GRZ-R6 rule as a permitted activity in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is astonishing. The KCDC plan needs to responsibly limit new building activities and structures in that zone moving forward with current known climate change impacts and predictions.  Amend the provisions associated with the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to reflect climate change and sea level rise, and strengthen wording to ensure less development in coastal environments that is needed in the District. In addition extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and marked Coastal Environment in the District to align with the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.35	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Metropolitan Centre Zone	Not specified	The submission notes that the provisions for this zone do not provide for the Metropolitan Centre Zone structure plan to be developed with Tangata Whenua, and that there may be resource management issues that arise with the development of twelve storey buildings.	Amend the Metropolitan Centre Zone provisions to provide for the Metropolitan Centre Zone structure plan to be developed with Tangata Whenua.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I note that the structure plan for the Metropolitan Centre Zone is already developed and incorporated into the operative District Plan through Appendix 19.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161	S161.36	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone	Not specified	The submission notes that the coastal qualifying matter precinct is defined as a precinct where the coastal hazards can be addressed through a future coastal environmental plan change and suggests in an indirect way that development may be enabled through this Plan Change. The text should recognise the Climate Change aspect of coastal hazards.	<b>Amend</b> the text in the Zone introduction that describes the purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, as follows:  <a href="#">The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct covers parts of the Working Zones near to the coast that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard. The purpose of this precinct is to identify the area within which the level of subdivision and development otherwise required by policy 3 of the NPS-UD will not be enabled until the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future coastal environment plan change. The precinct and the provisions associated with it will be reviewed as part of this future plan change process, due to serious coastal hazards risks posed in this precinct that will be worsened by the climate change. The future of development and or the management of present development in this precinct will be worked through with public and Mana Whenua through a future plan change as to not to encourage further and / or more development in this precinct.</a>	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I do not consider it appropriate to attempt to define the purpose or outcomes for the Council's future coastal environment plan change process through amendments to the introductory text sought by the submitter. I consider it more appropriate that the purpose and outcomes of the future coastal environment plan change process be determined through that process.  As a result, I consider that the amendments sought by the submitter would result in a less accurate representation of the purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  I note that this recommendation does not preclude engagement between Council and tangata whenua on the development of appropriate coastal hazard provisions as part of the future coastal environment plan change.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S161.36.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct cannot responsibly permit further development in the proposed small coastal margin proposed in the draft plan given the predictions the council is well aware of through the Takutai Kāpiti project and earlier climate change decisions sought as well as modelling. <b>Amend the text in the Zone introduction that describes the purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, as follows:</b> <b>The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct covers parts of the Working Zones near to the coast that have been identified as being potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard. The purpose of this precinct is to identify the area within which the level of subdivision and development otherwise required by policy 3 of the NPS-UD will not be enabled due to serious coastal hazard risks posed in this precinct that will be worsened by climate change impacts. The future of development and or the management of present development in this precinct will be worked through with public and Mana Whenua through a future plan change as to not to encourage further and/or more development in this precinct.</b> <b>In addition extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and marked Coastal Environment in the District to align with the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones.</b>	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.37	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	LCZ-P1	Not specified	The submission identifies that the Paekākāriki Village Design Guide has been removed to accommodate changes made to the Local Centre Zone provisions. The submission is concerned about this, in particular because: - it is unclear how the differences between different centres will be managed from a design perspective; - it is unclear whether the design guide that will be used is able to safeguard the existing values that are desired to be retained in Paekākāriki; - it is unclear whether these values can be protected in the proposed system.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-P1 to safeguard the existing values that are desired to be retained in the Paekākāriki Local Centre.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Appendix C to the Section 32 Evaluation Report describes that "The existing design guide is generally inconsistent with the level of development to be enabled within the Local Centre Zone at Paekākāriki under policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD. This design guide by proposed APP2 - Centres Design Guide".  On this basis, I consider that that the difference between local centres are appropriately managed through the Centres Design Guide.  In relation to existing values in the Paekākāriki local centre zone, I consider that these will continue to be provided for where they are a qualifying matter. I note that there is a scheduled heritage building in the Paekākāriki local centre zone, which will continue to be protected by the District Plan's historic heritage rules. I also note that guideline 74 of the Centres Guideline provides for new development located adjacent to a heritage building to give consideration to various matters related to the heritage building.  On this basis, I do not consider it necessary to amend LCZ-P1 in the manner sought by the submitter.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S161.38.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	LCZ-P3	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa raise concerns over amendments that reduce the level of protection or maintenance of amenity values which include cultural values. Ngāti Toa seek that the proposed language which weakens the level of protection for amenity values is amended to ensure those values are actively maintained and not just considered but recognised and provided for. <b>The Operative RPS and Proposed RPS Change 1 seek to provide for the relationship of Mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. Greater Wellington wishes to ensure that amendments to provisions do not affect how the District Plan recognises and provides for section 6(e).</b> <b>Greater Wellington seeks that amendments proposed by Plan Change 2 do not undermine the protection of cultural values in the District Plan and that section 6(3) requirements are adequately provided for, while recognising that amenity values change over time as required by the NPS-UD. We seek for cultural values to be adequately protected through other means in the District Plan if the proposed amendments regarding amenity values are pursued.</b>	Allow primary submission in part.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.38	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	LCZ-P3	Not specified	The submitter finds it astonishing that identity and character values are only 'considered' instead of assessed in a balancing manner in development proposals. The submission identifies that clause 5 of the policy follows an approach based on built form, instead of keeping the natural form. The submission notes that working zones do not have to look like working zones, and can be blended with work and taiao.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-P3 to ensure identity and character values are assessed in a balancing manner in development proposals.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that the amendment proposed by PC2 to LCZ-P3 enables an appropriately balanced approach to assessment of development in relation to identity and character values, because the retention of identity and character values is not provided for as a bottom-line. I also consider the amendments proposed by PC2 to be consistent with Objective 4 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S161	S161.39	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangāira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangāira	LCZ-P6	Not specified	The submission suggests the wording of LCZ-P6 to be strengthened to include Tangata Whenua involvement in Urban Form and Design of Centres.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-P6 as follows:  <a href="#">Subdivision, use and development in centres must be undertaken in a manner that achieves efficient integration with necessary infrastructure, reinforces the District's consolidated urban form and sense of place, and provides for a high quality interface between built form and public space. To achieve this, the principles in the Centres Design Principles in Appendix 29 Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2 will be applied with co-design input from Tangata Whenua, specifically if the higher density proposals in Metropolitan and Town Centre zones and heights proposed at twelve Storeys.</a>  <a href="#">A higher density of urban built form will be enabled in the Local Centre Zone including:</a> <a href="#">1. buildings up to 4-storeys within the Local Centre Zone; or</a> <a href="#">2. buildings up to 6-storeys within the Local Centre Zone at Paekākāriki.</a>	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	In my opinion, the amendment sought implies an obligation for applicants to consult with tangata whenua, even where tangata whenua may not be considered an affected person. I do not consider this to be appropriate in the context of clause 6(3) of Schedule 4 of the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S161.39.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	The RVA does not oppose the relief sought in this submission in principle, but seeks that the reference to the Centres Design Guide is excluded in relation to retirement villages, as per its primary submission.	Allow primary submission, subject to the relief sought in the RVA's primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S161.39.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	LCZ-P6	Oppose primary submission	Ryman does not oppose the relief sought in this submission in principle, but seeks that the reference to the Centres Design Guide is excluded in relation to retirement villages, as per its primary submission.	Allow primary submission, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S161	S161.40	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	TCZ-Px1	Not specified	The submission considers that it is at odds that the Council aims to somewhat restrict the development in the coastal qualifying matter precinct for coastal erosion reasons; but here by adding a new policy, TCZ-Px1, that says 'an urban built form not exceeding three-storeys is anticipated'.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-Px1 to clarify the inconsistent messaging that the policy creates especially in the context that the coastal qualifying matter precinct is crafted to not to enable the level of development required by the NPS-UD.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I do not consider that the policy contains any inconsistency. I consider it to be consistent with the purpose of the Precinct because the policy is worded to retain the status quo level of development provided for by the operative District Plan in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct of the Town Centre Zone. I therefore do not consider any amendments are necessary.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S161.40.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-Px2	Support primary submission	Agree that the reference to a new policy TCZ-Px1 that says 'an urban built form not exceeding three storey is anticipated' needs to be firmer and exclude such structures in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. Amend the policy to ensure that the level of development specified in the NPS-UD is not enabled within this zone by this plan change.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.41	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	GRUZ-R6	Not specified	The submission notes that it is restricting for Tangata Whenua if papakāinga located on Kāpiti Island must comply with the standards set out under GRUZ-R6.	<b>Amend</b> rule GRZ-Rx8 to reduce restrictions for papakāinga development on Kāpiti Island.	4.3 Papakāinga	The general standards for activities on Kāpiti Island under GRUZ-R6 were incorporated into the District Plan in 2008 and carried over into the Proposed District Plan in 2012. These standards apply to all activities on Kāpiti Island, and according to the Section 32 Evaluation Report for the Proposed District Plan the purpose of these standards to ensure that Kāpiti Island can achieve its intended purpose as a nature reserve. Because the standards under Rule GRUZ-R6 are intended to apply to all activities on Kāpiti Island, I consider that excluding papakāinga from needing to comply with the rule may undermine the purpose of the rule.  In relation to reducing restrictions for Papakāinga development on Kāpiti Island, I note that to some extent PC2 already achieves this by: - Providing for Papakāinga as a permitted activity on the Island (where it was previously a restricted discretionary activity under rule GRUZ-R12); and - Removing a range of site arrangement and outdoor living space requirements for papakāinga on Kāpiti Island that were previously required by rule GRUZ-R12.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S161	S161.42	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Not specified	The submission suggests the introduction text should include Tangata Whenua's decision-making involvement in the identification of financial contributions. The Rūnanga does not agree that offsetting should be included in this section. If an activity's impacts require offsetting, this usually means the environmental or cultural value will be lost. The Rūnanga opposes that activity to occur in the first place.	<b>Amend</b> the introduction text to the Financial Contributions chapter as follows: ... <u>Financial contributions under this Plan may be required in respect of the mitigation of avoiding, and remedying, mitigating or off-setting any adverse environmental effects that is (only like for like) on any or all of the following:</u>  • open spaces and reserves; • upgrading off-site infrastructure, before programmed works that will address any adverse environmental effects created by the proposed development; • significant heritage and ecological features; and • riparian margins; and • sites and areas of significance to iwi and Māori including awa, moana, motu, ngahere.  <u>In places of significance to iwi and Māori the contributions, amount and form of the contributions should be discussed with Tangata Whenua, kaitiakitanga of the whenua and if needed, transferring these powers to iwi.</u> ...	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	In relation to the matter of enabling financial contributions for the purposes of offsetting, because offsetting and compensation are not precluded by the District Plan (and I note that offsetting is specifically provided for in some parts), I do not consider it appropriate to limit or preclude the opportunity for financial contributions to contribute towards offsetting and compensation.  In relation to sites and areas of significance to Māori, I consider it appropriate to include reference to this because existing District Plan rules related these areas provide for the consideration of financial contributions (see for example SUB-DW-R10). However, I prefer the term <i>waahi tapu and other places and areas of significance to Māori</i> , because this is the relevant defined term in the District Plan. I also consider it appropriate to signal in the introduction text that, where appropriate, the Council will seek the advice of the relevant iwi authority when considering conditions related to financial contributions (for example, where they are in relation to effects on wāhi tapu and other places or areas of significance to Māori).	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend the introductory text to include: - reference to waahi tapu and other places and areas of significance to Māori; - an advice note that identifies that the Council will seek the advice of iwi authorities where appropriate.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend FC-R5 (refer section 15.3 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it would assist the Council with meeting its obligations under Policy 9(c) of the NPS-UD.
S197.FS.1	S161.42.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S161.42.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.43	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Not specified	The submission suggests an advice note be added that identifies that Tangata Whenua will be involved in decisions around financial contributions.	<b>Amend</b> the introduction text to the Financial Contributions chapter to add an advice note as follows: ... <u>Tangata Whenua will be involved in these decisions as the kaitiaki of the whenua.</u>	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	I consider that adding the advice note in response to S161.42 addresses this point. Note that for the reasons stated under submission point S161.42 I have recommended different wording to that suggested by the submitter.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer S161.42.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer S161.42.
S197.FS.1	S161.43.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S161.43.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.44	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FC-P3	Oppose	The submission opposes offsetting and compensation as this would provide for situations where damage is already done. Providing for offsetting and compensation means that Tangata Whenua accept the degradation of mauri. Financial contributions should be directed to avoiding these activities in the first place and mitigate if there were any need after that.	<b>Amend</b> FC-P3 as follows: <u>FC-P3 Financial contributions to offset or compensate for adverse ensure positive effects</u>  <u>A financial contribution may be required for any land use or subdivision application to ensure positive effects on the environment are achieved to offset any adverse effects that cannot otherwise be avoided, remedied or mitigated mitigate and avoid the adverse effects on the environment.</u>  <b>Delete</b> all references to offsetting and compensation from the Financial Contributions chapter.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Because offsetting and compensation are not precluded by the District Plan (and I note that offsetting is specifically provided for in some parts), I do not consider it appropriate to limit or preclude the opportunity for financial contributions to contribute towards offsetting and compensation.  I note that enabling financial contributions to ensure positive effects on the environment to offset any adverse effect is consistent with sections 77E(2)(a) and 108(10)(a) of the RMA.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S161.44.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	FC-P3	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S161.44.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	FC-P3	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.45	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	FC-R5	Not specified	The submission notes that, depending on the location and nature of the proposal, Tangata Whenua would want involvement in determining the land and the amount regarding the contributions. The submission identifies that land should always be able to be offered to Tangata Whenua.	<b>Amend</b> FC-R5 to add additional phrases to include Tangata Whenua's principles and roles, as rangatiratanga (decision-maker) and kaitiakitanga along with Council partners.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	I consider that the matters raised by the submitter are in part addressed by my recommendations on S100.49 and S203.54.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer S100.49 and S203.54.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer S100.49 and S203.54.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197.FS.1	S161.45.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	FC-R5	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S161.45.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	FC-R5	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.46	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	CF-Px1	Not specified	The submission finds the purpose of the new policy unclear. The submission suggests this to be redrafted to make sure the wording is clear and that we are not meaning to invite all members of community to Papakāinga facilities.	<b>Amend</b> CF-Px1 to clarify that community facilities as part of a papakāinga should be established for Tangata Whenua use only.	4.3 Papakāinga	I acknowledge the concern raised by the submitter but do not consider that the policy requires community facilities to be developed for the use of all members of the community. Community facilities would be enabled by the policy if the developer of a papakāinga chose to do so. This is reinforced by the reference to community facilities being enabled where they are consistent with the objectives and policies for papakāinga.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S161	S161.47	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Schedule 9	Support	The submissions supports the addition of Kārewarewa Urupā to Schedule 9 of the District Plan.	<b>Retain</b> the addition of Kārewarewa Urupā to Schedule 9 of the District Plan.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S104.FS.1	S161.47.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	Schedule 9	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.48	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Schedule 9	Not specified	The submission notes concern that in the absence of including a new review of Sites and Areas of Significance to iwi and Māori, additional sites and their spatial scope may not be provided protection at a level desired by Tangata Whenua.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to identify that there will be a policy gap in areas where intensification has been enabled, but where sites and areas of significance to iwi and Māori have yet to be identified in the District Plan.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that the potential gap between the places acknowledged in Schedule 9 and places or areas of significance to Māori not included in the schedule is acknowledged under policy SASM-P1, which refers to the Council working in partnership with the relevant iwi authority for the ongoing and long term management and protection of wāhi tapu. This gap is also acknowledged under policy HH-P7, which relates to unidentified historic heritage (including wāhi tapu and other places and areas of significance to Māori).  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together on a broader review of sites and areas of significance to Māori as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S161.48.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Schedule 9	Support primary submission	Ngāti Toa seek amendments to identify that there will be a policy gap in areas where intensification has been enabled, but where sites and areas of significance to iwi and Māori have yet to be identified in the District Plan. Greater Wellington seek to ensure that all sites of significance are captured in the District Plan and appropriate protection from effects of intensification are provided, including on properties surrounding those sites.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S104.FS.1	S161.48.FS02	Waikanae Land Company	Schedule 9	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S161	S161.49	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Definition: QUALIFYING MATTER AREA	Not specified	The submission is concerned that the items in the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA may be interpreted as being listed in order of importance. The submission suggests the addition of an explanatory note to state that they are in random order. If they are not listed in random order, it is far from ideal that SASM schedule is down at the bottom of the list. The submission opposes that a Tangata Whenua matter can be put in order of importance by Council.	<b>Amend</b> the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA to add an explanatory note that states that the matters are listed in a random order.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Refer S100.46.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting wording has been used consistent with that sought under S100.46.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer S100.46.
S244.FS.1	S161.FS01	McDonald, Deidre	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support full submission. Agree that planning for development in the absence of securing infrastructure, including three waters infrastructure, would be likely to fall short of the needs of the community once the development has taken place. The KDC is obligated to uphold Te Tiriti o Waitangi, including actively protecting cultural amenity values (see their submission on DO-011 Character and Amenity). Concern that 'residential intensification will 'only' give consideration to the effects of subdivision and development on character and amenity values. Concerned some of these values have embedded cultural components and are part of sites and areas of significance and culturally sensitive areas.' Raising the fundamental point that suitable infrastructure is not a qualifying matter, but it should be. Particularly for Otaki, which has a diesel-powered train service that runs twice a day to Wellington, roads that are narrow (especially the local shopping centre in Mill Road), and no traffic lights except for the SH1 area. Allowing or encouraging high density housing in such an area would seem to run counter to climate change obligations, where most residents are reliant on their vehicles.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S161.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission. The mental health of homeless and badly housed people is very important, as is the mental health of people currently living on the Kapiti Coast. Neither group should take precedence. All people need access to housing, services, social connections, and places to spiritually replenish.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S162	S162.01	Lee, Angela	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submitter supports the submissions of Glen Wiggs (S098) and Pat Duignan (S105 and S106).	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S162.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Otaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree that coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the draft District Plan. Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S162	S162.02	Lee, Angela	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submitter supports the submissions of Glen Wiggs (S098) and Pat Duignan (S105 and S106).	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S162.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. Our communities are well aware that coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. We agree with the reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps and Adaptation zones. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S162	S162.03	Lee, Angela	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submitter supports the submissions of Glen Wiggs (S098) and Pat Duignan (S105 and S106).	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include those areas at Waikanae Beach and Peka Peka Beach subject to inundation at 0.40m RSLR, 0.65m RSLR, 0.85m RSLR 1.25m RSLR or 1.65m RSLR on the KCDC Coastal Inundation Susceptibility Mapping Tool.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter E in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the spatial extent of PREC3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the General Residential Zone at Peka Peka Beach (refer section 19.8 and Appendix F of PC(R1)). Amend the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter (refer section 4.1 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S162	S162.04	Lee, Angela	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submitter supports the submissions of Glen Wiggs (S098) and Pat Duignan (S105 and S106).	Further, or alternatively <b>amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include the current Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct at Waikanae Beach, and that accordingly all existing Beach Residential Precinct plan provisions continue to apply to the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach and the Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 be removed from the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S163	S163.01	Cooper, Dianne	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submitter supports the submission of W.G.T. Wiggs (S098).  The submitter understands the need to have intensification, but questions the wisdom of allowing intensification in an area so close to the sea as Waikanae Beach and in low-lying areas prone to flooding.  The submitter's property has never suffered from flooding because the subdivision was created on a building platform, however in recent months surrounding properties have flooded.  Until work is done to fully identify the nature and extent of natural and coastal hazards, it seems appropriate to protect the current status of Waikanae Beach by including it in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S163.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree with questioning the draft plan recommendation of allowing intensification in areas close to Kāpiti Coast Beaches and in low-lying areas prone to flooding along our coastal region. We agree that limiting intensification in coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions.  Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the draft District Plan. We further recommend that Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S163	S163.02	Cooper, Dianne	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 163.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S163.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree that coastal environments that will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current modelling and Takutai Kāpiti publications on KCDC website. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S163	S163.03	Cooper, Dianne	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 163.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include those areas at Waikanae Beach and Peka Peka Beach subject to inundation at 0.40m RSLR, 0.65m RSLR, 0.85m RSLR 1.25m RSLR or 1.65m RSLR on the KCDC Coastal Inundation Susceptibility Mapping Tool.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter E in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the spatial extent of PREC3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the General Residential Zone at Peka Peka Beach (refer section 19.8 and Appendix F of PC(R1)). Amend the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter (refer section 4.1 of PC(R1)). <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S163	S163.04	Cooper, Dianne	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 163.01.	Further, or alternatively <b>amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include the current Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct at Waikanae Beach, and that accordingly all existing Beach Residential Precinct plan provisions continue to apply to the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach and the Residential Intensification Precinct B PREC2 be removed from the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S164	S164.01	Reichelt, Bettina and Hartmut	155-205 Paelawa Road, Peka Peka	Not specified	These properties, located to the east of Paelawa Road, are located on elevated land dune sites not suitable for rural production activities.  Existing restrictions on the properties have enhanced the biodiversity of the area. They properties are located away from the beachfront and suitable for more intense peri-urban living.  The submissions states that the current zoning of the sites is an anomaly, and notes that the properties to the north on Paelawa Road are residential zoned. The properties are connected to potable water and are located in a 50km/h speed zone.	<b>Rezone</b> 155-205 Paelawa Road, Peka Peka from General Rural Zone to Large Lot or Settlement Zone, enabling lots of 2,000 to 6,000m2 to be created on these sites.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S100.FS.1	S164.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S164.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	155-205 Paetawa Road, Peka Peka	Oppose primary submission	KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S165	S165.01	Robertson, David	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S165.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree that the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts referenced in Jacobs Volume 2 report is not sufficient to address the predicted climate change impacts that our coastal environments will experience in the next 100 years, such as sea level rise, storm surges, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the draft District Plan. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S165	S165.02	Robertson, David	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S165.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S166	S166.01	Munro, Steven	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S166.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree that the draft Plan and proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts referenced in Jacobs Volume 2 report is insufficient to address the predicted climate change impacts that our coastal environments will experience in the next 100 years, such as sea level rise, storm surges, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, inundation, flooding etc. The new KCDC Plan must limit intensification in these coastal environments, which will align with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known climate impact modelling. Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the draft District Plan. We recommend the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S166	S166.02	Munro, Steven	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S166.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S167	S167.01	Edwards, Lorraine	Inundation areas	Oppose	The submission opposes the proposal to allow 3 three storey houses on residential sections in Waikanae Beach. This area is subject to inundation as it is an area that has been developed on swamp land. Recent heavy rainfall has shown that many properties are affected by flooding.	<b>Reject</b> the application of the MDRS on residential sections in an area subject to inundation.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S168	S168.01	Ranford, Brian and Curtis, Michelle	157 Field Way, Waikanae Beach	Not specified	The submission provides several reasons for rezoning the land, including (but not limited to): - Rezoning of the site from rural to urban would achieve the requirements and outcomes contained in the NPS-UD, the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and the KCDC Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment. - Historically, most of the property that the submissions seeks to be rezoned was previously zoned urban. - If green belting the northern extremities of Waikanae urban areas by virtue of rural block designations was relevant in 2001, it is not relevant now, as evidenced by the urban encroachment of subdivided sections in Peka Peka. - The proposed subdivision of part of the submitters property is merely a continuation of the existing urban environment around the property. - The property is on an existing public transport route. - All services and amenities are in place and operational.	<b>Rezone</b> the part of 157 Field Way (Lot 13 DP 85561) that abuts Field Way as urban land to allow a subdivision of that land into residential lots.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S168.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	157 Field Way, Waikanae Beach	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S169	S169.01	Small, David	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S169.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree to the submission opposing the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results as the basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. We agree the Precincts be enlarged.  Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PREC3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. At a minimum use the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones to be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S169	S169.02	Small, David	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S169.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S170	S170.01	Kapiti Cycling Action (Kapiti Cycling Incorporated)	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	Proposed Plan Change 2 enables significant intensification of population density within zones and precincts that are "close to centres and public open spaces with good access to public transport" but no reference is made to good access to active transport facilities. Much existing active transport infrastructure is inadequate.  If New Zealand is to achieve its goal of changing to a low emissions economy, PPC2 needs to embrace active transport modes by specifically identifying, defining and providing for modern day safe facilities required by walkers and cyclists now.	<b>Review</b> the Plan from an active transport perspective to explicitly provide for the adding to or upgrading of existing and inadequate Active Transport facilities and infrastructure, primarily on arterial routes and serving those precincts and zones where more intensive development is proposed, ahead of when that development occurs.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	In relation to the provision for active transport facilities as part of the Council's transport network, I consider this matter is most appropriately addressed either through the Council's Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.6	S170.01.FS01	Landlink	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support the provision of making amendments to the District Plan which encourage and give greater consideration to active modes of transport - noting this in turn contributes towards achieving the objectives of the NPS-UD.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S170.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S170	S170.02	Kapiti Cycling Action (Kapiti Cycling Incorporated)	Design Guides	Not specified	The submission supports the requirement for bike parking facilities. However, good quality bikes are expensive, ebikes costing more than many used cars and owners understandably are nervous about storing them anywhere other than in a secure fully enclosed lockup facility.	<b>Amend</b> the picture on page 7, section 6 of the Design Guidelines (6.1 Site Layout, Access and Bicycle Parking) replaced with an image of a fully enclosed lockup bike storage facility.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I consider that guideline 7 provides a sufficient prompt for users of the Design Guides to consider the appropriate level of security for bicycle storage facilities, while providing for design flexibility.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S170.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Design Guides	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S171	S171.01	Lewis, Keith	PREC14 - Paraparumu Low Density Housing Precinct	Not specified	The area between Buckley Grove, Ventnor Drive and Old SH1 was zoned Low Density Residential some 25 years ago, in part because large parts of it were in a ponding area. The parts located above the "true" ponding area (see submission point S171.02) could be used safely for General Residential purposes, but those located within the ponding area should not be.	<b>Prevent</b> infilling, and <b>only allow</b> building that does not require infilling, in the (true) ponding area of the present Low Density Residential Area between Buckley Grove and Ventnor Drive.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.  In relation to flood hazards, I consider that the flood hazard provisions in the operative District Plan provide for the appropriate management of flood hazards as part of undertaking new development.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S171	S171.02	Lewis, Keith	District Plan Maps: Flood Hazard overlay	Not specified	The submission identifies that the area around Ventnor Drive is raised above the ponding area, and should be identified as a "Shallow Surface Flow" area in the flood hazard maps. The submission notes that this was discussed with Council officers in 2018, and it was understood that this would be amended.	<b>Correct</b> the flood hazard maps that show areas of Shallow Surface Flow as areas of Ponding (in relation to the area between Buckley Grove and Ventnor Drive).	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	The Council's latest publicly available flood hazard model (see <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/LocalMaps/Viewer/?map=4ca9a2e98d134a749c8f4ee4c5f1170f">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/LocalMaps/Viewer/?map=4ca9a2e98d134a749c8f4ee4c5f1170f</a> ) does in fact identify this area as being a shallow surface flow area. On this basis, I consider it appropriate to amend the flood hazard map in this area to correct this inconsistency.  I note that this will not change the rules that apply to the area, as the same rules that apply to ponding areas also apply to shallow surface flow areas (see section 4.10.1 of the body of the report).	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the District Plan maps at Ventnor Drive. Refer to section 19.11 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more effective incorporation of the MDRS into the District Plan in relation to an existing qualifying matter, by ensuring consistency between the Council's publicly available flood hazard model and the District Plan maps on the specified land at Ventnor Drive.
S172	S172.01	Clode, Brian	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S172	S172.01	Clode, Brian	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S172.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S172.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree to the submission opposing the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results as the basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. We agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making.  Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the draft District Plan. We recommend that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S173	S173.01	Smith, John	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S173.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged landward of the proposed eastern boundary. We agree to the submission opposing the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results as the basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. We agree limiting intensification in our coastal environments is aligned with the intentions of current Government Policy (such as NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA). Replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts with enlarged areas, at a minimum the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S173	S173.02	Smith, John	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S173.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S174	S174.01	Abernethy, Evan	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S174.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the proposed Coastal Environment and the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts are too limiting and a narrow coastal strip. We also recommend that the Coastal Environment area throughout the district should be increased. We know predictions show that our Coastal areas will be affected by climate change impacts, such as sea level rise, erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in our coastal region is aligned with the intention of current Government Policy (such as Part 2 of RMA) and wise future decision making. Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. At a minimum use the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones to be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S174	S174.02	Abernethy, Evan	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S174.01 is not accepted, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S174.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. Our culturally significant coastal environments along with our all our communities will be affected by increasing and compounding climate change impacts that will cause significant damage within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with precautionary approaches and best practice decision making The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S174	S174.03	Abernethy, Evan	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S174.01 and S174.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S174	S174.04	Abernethy, Evan	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S174.01 and S174.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S175	S175.01	Abernethy, Sally	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.</p> <p>The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.</p> <p>The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.</p> <p>The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.</p> <p>The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.</p> <p>The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.</p>	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S175.01.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S175.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged landward of the proposed eastern boundary. We agree to the exposed coastal hazards such as inundation and sea level rise needs to ensure that flooding and father climate change impacts are used as the basis for determining the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. We agree to limiting intensification in our coastal environments is aligned with the intentions of current Government Policy (such as NZCPS Policy 25 and Part 2 of the RMA). Replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts with enlarged areas, at a minimum the Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S175	S175.02	Abernethy, Sally	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.</p> <p>The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.</p>	Alternatively, if submission S175.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S175.02.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S175.02.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree that the District Plan Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged. We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kapiti Hazard Susceptibility Assessment Adaptation Zones that are areas highly likely to 'affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years'. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked at a minimum for the Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S175	S175.03	Abernethy, Sally	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S175.01 and S175.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S175.03.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S175	S175.04	Abernethy, Sally	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S175.01 and S175.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S175.04.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Local Centre Zone	Support primary submission	<p>Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S176	S176.01	Padamsey, Salima	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218).	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S176.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond that identified in the Jacobs Report Volume 2. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones that those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy (NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA) and precautionary decision making based on known predictions. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S176	S176.02	Padamsey, Salima	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S176.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S177	S177.01	Cathie, Richard	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.  The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.  The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.  The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.  The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kāpiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.  The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S177.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged. We agree with limiting intensification in our coastal environments due to known climate change impacts is aligned with Government Policy (such as Policy 25 and Part 2 of the RMA), precautionary approaches and best practice decision making. Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked at a minimum as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S177	S177.02	Cathie, Richard	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.  The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.	Alternatively, if submission S177.01 is not accepted, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S177.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti project published Adaptation Zones that those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, coastal erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is thus subject to Policy 25. The Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S177	S177.03	Cathie, Richard	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S177.01 and S177.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S177	S177.04	Cathie, Richard	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S177.01 and S177.02.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S178	S178.01	O'Regan, John and Margaret	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission states that Plan Change 2 would violate NZCPS 2010 Policy 25, since it permits redevelopment in the form of intensification by way of the MDRS in the area of Kapiti District exposed to coastal hazards, specifically the hazards of inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.</p> <p>The submission notes that the Council argues that existing District Plan flood hazard provisions ensure PC2 does not violate Policy 25. The submitter considers that the increase in the risk of economic harm from coastal hazards in areas subject to flooding influenced by sea level rise is not eliminated just because habitable floor levels are required to be above the 1% AEP level. Intensification would materially increase exposure to economic loss in these areas.</p> <p>The submission notes that PC2 includes a "Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct" but that is confined to a narrow strip of coast and solely related to erosion risk. The relief sought is that the Precinct landward boundary should be much further east to include the entire area subject to the hazard of coastal inundation.</p> <p>The submission identifies that at present the District Plan includes an area designated as the "Coastal Environment". The submitter considers this is the best available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years" where Policy 25 applies. The submitter considers intensification will increase the risk of harm from coastal hazards in this area.</p> <p>The submission states that the Council adopted Beach Residential Precincts to recognise and provide for particular areas that contribute to the outstanding amenity of the Kapiti Coast. The submitter considers the impact of height in these sensitive areas will be significant and out of proportion to the loss of potential further intensification.</p> <p>The submission also references Part 2 of the RMA, higher order planning documents and other relevant documents and literature.</p>	Amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S178.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree with this submission that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged. We agree known predicted climate change impacts will severely affect our Coastal Environments and thus limiting intensification in the Precincts is aligned with Government Policy (such as Policy 25 and Part 2 of the RMA).</p> <p>Extend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. Further we recommend the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked at a minimum as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S178	S178.02	O'Regan, John and Margaret	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	<p>The submission notes that the Council has published maps as part of the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment that delineate Adaptation Zones.</p> <p>The submission states that these maps establish that flooding in the areas delineated as Adaptation Zones is affected by sea level and is therefore a coastal hazard. The submitter considers that Adaptation Zones are therefore an "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next hundred years", and therefore subject to policy 25.</p>	Alternatively, if submission S178.01 is not accepted, amend the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S178.02.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<p>Agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti project identified Adaptation Zones that those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards within the next 100 years (such as sea level rise, erosion, inundation, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc). Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is thus subject to Policy 25.</p> <p>Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S178	S178.03	O'Regan, John and Margaret	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	See submission points S178.01 and S178.02.	Further or alternatively, amend PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S178	S178.04	O'Regan, John and Margaret	Local Centre Zone	Not specified	See submission points S178.01 and S178.02.	Further or alternatively, amend the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S179	S179.01	Dunmore, Paul	GRZ-Px7, GRZ-R6, Town Centre Zone: Introduction, TCZ-Px1, District Plan Maps	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks the complete removal of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. PC2 asserts that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is necessary to give effect to policy 25 of the NZCPS. Policy 25 can only be implemented in the context of Policy 24, to which KCDC has so far failed to give effect.</p> <p>The submission states that the contention that their property would not be lost to erosion in the next 100 years, unless some future Council chooses to abandon its responsibility to protect important community infrastructure (including coastal defences and Marine Parade).</p> <p>The submission states that the claim that properties in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct have been identified as potentially susceptible to coastal erosion hazard is unsupported. Consequently, the precinct is not a valid method of giving effect to the NZCPS, s77(b) of the Act does not apply, and the precinct must be removed in its entirety.</p> <p>The submitter considers that policies GRZ-Px7 and TCZ-Px1 do not achieve integrated management of effects (in terms of s31(1)(a) of the RMA). These policies assert that the management of coastal hazards is not being addressed, pending a future plan change at an unspecified date. Therefore these are not policies that can be properly included in the District Plan. When the Council has developed a proper set of coastal hazard provisions, any appropriate controls would be included in those provisions. Some intensification may occur in the meantime, but this is a reason for Council to develop a Plan change.</p> <p>The submission supports the submission of Coastal Ratepayer's United Inc (S119 and S218).</p>	Remove the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct completely from the Plan. As a consequence, the coastal yard setbacks must also be removed.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S179.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Px7, GRZ-R6, Town Centre Zone: Introduction, TCZ-Px1, District Plan Maps	Oppose primary submission	<p>Disagree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts (especially those currently identified in the Draft Plan) are not areas that are potentially at risk of coastal erosion. They are as identified in the Takutai Kāpiti Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2. We are well aware that predicted climate change impacts will severely affect our Coastal Environments and thus limiting intensification in the Precincts is aligned with Government Policy (such as Policy 25 and Part 2 of the RMA).</p> <p>Ensure Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S180	S180.01	Ngati Haumia ki Paekakariki	General - Paekakariki	Not specified	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Ngati Haumia Ki Paekakariki (NHKP) have been alienated from their whenua for generations. Intensified housing will do little to encourage them back to their whenua, as cost and unaffordability is key to this issue. - Housing should be provided in the right places, for the right people, and at the right price. - The number of Ngati Haumia Ki Paekakariki whanau living in Pakakariki has dwindled from 30 to 4. The health of the whenua and culture of the community could be enhanced if there were where for their people to move home to. - Social and affordable housing should be provided, alongside different ways of living, renting or owning a home. Through mechanisms like papakāinga, so a diversity of people, and those who are local, can be housed as a priority. - The wider community needs to benefit from the growth. - The District's average house price is out of reach for the community. - Enabling intensification should be undertaken with the goal of providing housing at a price, through a mechanism such as a Community Land Trust. - Better use needs to be made of housing that already exists. - NHKP whanau have to have housing to move back to in order to take the concept of having a marae in the village further.  The submission also refers to the operative District Plan provisions that manage the special character in the Paekakariki Beach Residential Precinct, and references the character attributes outlined in the Beach Residential Precincts - Paekakariki: Character Assessment (Appendix G of the S32 Evaluation Report).	Limit intensification to two storeys in the whole of Paekakariki township.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	While I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitter, I consider that limiting building heights to two storeys across the whole of Paekakariki would be contrary to the requirement to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Paekakariki.	Do not accept.	No.
S180	S180.02	Ngati Haumia ki Paekakariki	General	Not specified	See submission point S180.01.	Study the effects on waterways and the environment that an increase population and development will have.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	While I do not consider that such a study would fit within the Council's district planning functions, I note that does not preclude Council and tangata whenua from working together on this matter outside of the District Plan.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S180	S180.03	Ngati Haumia ki Paekakariki	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Intensification must be supported by infrastructure to enable people to live sustainable, socially connected lives. - There needs to be an understanding of how many people Paekakariki's infrastructure can sustainably support into the future. - There needs to be a better understanding as to how many people are trying to be housed across the district, and how to achieve this most effectively.	Complete a detailed development plan, including infrastructure development and building rules, before any intensification.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.  I note in particular that the Council is required to review whether there is sufficient existing or planned infrastructure available across the district to support development capacity on a regular basis as part of undertaking its Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment under the NPS-UD. The Council is also required to review infrastructure provision as part of its Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy, and the Council is required to engage with tangata whenua on this matter when these reviews occur.  In relation to District Plan rules, as outlined in the body of the report, I consider that there are sufficient provisions across the District Plan to require the provision of adequate infrastructure as part of development.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S054.FS.1	S180.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Need to develop a detailed plan (including infrastructure needs) before intensification begins.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S180	S180.04	Ngati Haumia ki Paekakariki	General	Not specified	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - There is the potential for the development of a Marae at the northern end of Pakakariki, and any new development should be cognisant of this aspiration. - NHKP have aspirations to develop papakāinga at Paekakariki. The potential for intensification to hinder these aspirations is concerning. - Explore the potential for papakāinga in some parts of the Open Space Zone, to the north end of Paekakariki. - It is important that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the development of papakāinga.	Take into account the effects any intensification in Paekakariki will have on Marae/papakāinga development aspirations.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I note that marae are provided for as a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone (but not the Open Space Zone) at Paekakariki under rule CF-R2 in the Operative District Plan. I also note that papakāinga are provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity in the General Residential Zone (but not the Open Space Zone) at Paekakariki under the provisions of PC2.  In relation to the matter of infrastructure capacity, I discuss this in further detail at section 4.2.5 of the body of the report. In summary, I note that the NPS-UD obliges the Council to plan for sufficient infrastructure capacity across the District (including at Paekakariki) in the short, medium and long terms. In addition to this, there are a range of District Plan provisions that require new development to be adequately serviced.  I therefore consider that the general ability to undertake development of marae and papakāinga are provided for by the provisions of the operative District Plan and PC2. I consider that potential impacts of intensification (as it relates to infrastructure capacity) are able to be managed both through the Council's obligations to plan for infrastructure under the NPS-UD, and through District Plan provisions that require new development to be adequately serviced.	Accept. Noting that the I consider that the matters raised by the submitter are generally taken into account.  I also note that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this marae and papakāinga development aspirations outside of PC2.	No.
S161.FS.1	S180.FS01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngati Toa Rangatira	Full submission	Support primary submission	We support these submission points as the current proposed papakāinga chapter allows for papakāinga in several other zones. However, allowing for papakāinga in other zones should be explored to ensure that tangata whenua have opportunities to develop papakāinga and support their aspirations in as many zones as possible. We would like ancestral land currently zoned as Open Space in Paekakariki and / or Kapiti to be enabled for tangata whenua to implement their full Tino Rangaratanga so that they can reconnect with their whenua and District Plan zoning should not be a barrier for them to do this.  The submission also brings up important points regarding considering the impacts of intensification on tangata whenua and matters of significance such as our sites, values and aspirations. We alongside intensification it is important to consider and avoid impacts on matters of significance to Māori they would effect cultural wellbeing.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S181	S181.01	Nicholls, Gregory	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission supports the submissions of the Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc (S105) and William Glen Turner Wiggs (S098).	Amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones Hazard which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S181.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Also supported Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc and William Glen Turner Wiggs submissions to enlarge the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti project identified Adaptation Zones that those areas will potentially be affected by climate change impacts within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification along our coastal regions is thus in alignment with Government Policy. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S181	S181.02	Nicholls, Gregory	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	The submission supports the submissions of the Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc (S105) and William Glen Turner Wiggs (S098).	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S181	S181.03	Nicholls, Gregory	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	The submission supports the submissions of the Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc (S105) and William Glen Turner Wiggs (S098).	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S181	S181.04	Nicholls, Gregory	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission supports the submissions of the Waikanae Beach Residents Society Inc (S105) and William Glen Turner Wiggs (S098).	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S182	S182.01	Wilson Group Developments Otaki Ltd	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Not specified	The submission relates to a site which is subject to a subdivision consent to adjust the boundaries between 255 Rangiuuru Road and 15 Matai Street. The boundary adjustment incorporated a large portion of the 15 Matai Street site into 255 Rangiuuru Road. The subdivision consent was granted in May 2022. Consents for subdivision of the new parent allotment at 255 Rangiuuru Road are currently lodged with Council. The site is part of the General Residential Zone.  The submission seeks that the part of the site that was incorporated into 255 Rangiuuru Road be included within PREC2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) on the basis that it is now accessed by 255 Rangiuuru Road, which is within the 400m walkable distance of the Town Centre Zone.  The submission identifies other reasons in support of the submission, including (but not limited to): the proximity of the site to the Town Centre Zone, facilitating cohesive urban form outcomes, low constraints on the site, the ability to service the site with existing or planned infrastructure, and development with a strong potential to be realised.  The submission states that the changes sought have the potential to give effect to several policies in the NPS-UD.	<b>Amend</b> the boundary of PREC2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) to include the land which was formerly 15 Matai Street, Ōtaki (identified in Figure 4, page 8 of the original submission).	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	Yes. Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.10 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S183	S183.01	Puke Ra Ltd	269-298 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support	The submission supports the proposed rezoning for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - The area is a cohesive area of relatively unconstrained land within the Waikanae Urban Limit. It is well connected to and supported by existing social infrastructure, and is within an area suitable for development. - The area has already been earmarked for future growth, being identified as 'future urban growth zone' on the northern edges of Waikanae. - Services pass through the area, including water and wastewater. - Existing constraints (such as those associated with flood hazard and the stream corridor that passes along the northern edge of the area) can be managed through existing district plan provisions. - The area has the potential to make a notable contribution to development capacity noting the theoretical dwelling estimate is 150 dwellings.	<b>Approve</b> the proposed rezoning of 298 Ngarara Road, and other land within the area identified as 269-289 Ngarara Road, from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S183.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	269-298 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S184	S184.01	Watters, Jonathan and Rachel	269-298 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support	The submission supports the proposed rezoning for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - The area is a cohesive area of relatively unconstrained land within the Waikanae Urban Limit. It is well connected to and supported by existing social infrastructure, and is within an area suitable for development. - The area has already been earmarked for future growth, being identified as 'future urban growth zone' on the northern edges of Waikanae. - Services pass through the area, including water and wastewater. - Existing constraints (such as those associated with flood hazard and the stream corridor that passes along the northern edge of the area) can be managed through existing district plan provisions. - The area has the potential to make a notable contribution to development capacity noting the theoretical dwelling estimate is 150 dwellings.	<b>Approve</b> the proposed rezoning of 283 Ngarara Road, and other land within the area identified as 269-289 Ngarara Road, from Future Urban Zone to General Residential Zone as notified.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S184.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	269-298 Ngarara Road, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S185	S185.01	McArthur, Angela	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Tier 1 classification for Waikanae Beach and for Kapiti Coast as a whole, for the following reasons: - The area proposed as Precinct B for intensification up to 4 storeys (15m) is excessive and unnecessary given the limitations of the Local Centre Zone and the surrounding residential character. - The boundary of the intensification precinct shown of draft District Plan Map 06, extends as far as the Rural Zone which is inappropriate. - Waikanae Beach has limited employment opportunities, no transport hub or services to support the need for taller buildings and additional intensification.	Delete PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B [it is inferred that the precinct to be deleted is the precinct that surrounds the Waikanae Beach Local Centre Zone].	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area around the Waikanae Beach (Te Moana Road) Local Centre Zone.  I also note the following in response to the matters raised in the submission: - In addition to the existing activities that occur there, the provisions of the Local Centre Zone at Waikanae Beach (Te Moana Road) provide for the development of a range of commercial activities and community services to serve the needs of the local community, as a permitted activity. Taking this into account, I consider the application of Residential Intensification Precinct B to be appropriate, and necessary to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. - I do not consider it inappropriate that the boundary of the precinct abuts the General Rural Zone, because the area where the precinct applies is adjacent to the Local Centre Zone. Given the size and nature of the area of Rural Zone adjacent to the precinct, I consider it unlikely that there would be any notable reverse sensitivity issues. - In relation to access to employment opportunities and transport, while I do not consider these to be primary considerations in applying Policy 3(d), I do consider the area to be accessible by a range of transport modes including public transport (there is a bus route that runs along Te Moana Road), active transport (there are cycle routes along Te Moana Road which connect to the cycle network that runs the length of the Kāpiti Expressway) and private vehicle (the area is located adjacent to the Te Moana Road expressway interchange).	Do not accept.	No.
S185	S185.02	McArthur, Angela	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Not specified	While the Residential Design Guide uses good urban design principles in regard to site layout, building form and appearance, amenity and sustainability, the guide will be interpreted at convenience only if a future proposal/ development complies with the General Residential Zoning Standards. The proposed standards in relation to building heights and set back from boundaries will guarantee that there will be additional adverse amenity effects on adjoining residents.  The submitter anticipates lots of unhappy residents once 4 and 6 storied or even 3 storied developments happen in neighbourhoods.  Loss of amenity due to additional shading, overlooking and loss or privacy do not need consideration if the proposal complies with the GRZ standards. Policy GRZ-P10 below implies that residents on adjoining sites are not affected if standards are complied with.	No specific decision requested by submitter.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	The submitter is correct that, where a development complies with the permitted activity standards for the General Residential Zone, the Design Guides would not be considered, as the development would be permitted and there would be no resource consent process through with to give consideration to the Design Guides. This is consistent with the requirements of Schedule 3A of the RMA.  As the submitter does not request specific relief, I do not make a recommendation.	No recommendation. No decision requested.	No.
S054.FS.1	S185.02.FS01	Jonas, Malu	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S185	S185.03	McArthur, Angela	GRZ-P10	Not specified	Policy GRZ-P10 Residential Amenity 4. Buildings and structures will be designed to ensure they are compatible with the planned built character of the Zone Amenity required in terms of acceptable minimum hours of sunlight penetration to primary living and outdoor areas in mid-winter there is no guidance. This applies to future residence within new developments. The design guide needs to be more prescriptive when it comes to sunlight and shading effects. Requiring minimum sunlight hours within primary living areas such as 4 hours a day in mid-winter should be required. The residential design guide and policies needs to take into consideration quality of life and potential mental health concerns due to intensification and tall buildings in inappropriate locations around the Kapiti Coast.	No specific decision requested by submitter.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider it inappropriate to include standards within rules or guidance in the Design Guides that specify a minimum number of hours of sunlight to be achieved. Firstly, I consider this may create situations where it is not possible to undertake development which would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS as a permitted activity. For example, there may be some sites (such as sites in areas with heavy vegetation, or sites on south-facing slopes) that would not be able to comply with such a standard. Secondly, I consider that it would be impractical to implement such a standard, because the changing nature of the surrounding environment (including through the planting of trees or new permitted building development on surrounding sites) may cause the development to no longer comply with the standard. Additionally, I do not consider there to be sufficient information to determine what an appropriate minimum number of hours of sunlight would be.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S185.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-P10	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S185	S185.04	McArthur, Angela	GRZ-P12	Not specified	Policy GRZ-P12 Landscaping 1. The visual impact of large buildings will be reduced by appropriate screening and planting; 4. Sunlight access and passive surveillance to adjoining areas will not be unreasonably restricted; What is considered unreasonable in terms of additional shading effects on residents within adjoining sites. The interpretation of 'unreasonably restricted' within adjoining areas (within the development itself) is widely open for interpretation and likely to be ignored. Reducing the visual impact of large and tall buildings with foreground planting will add to shading effects.	No specific decision requested by submitter.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the interpretation of the matters outlined under policy GRZ-P12 (and what is considered reasonable or unreasonable under the policy) is most appropriately undertaken on a case-by-case basis through as part of the consideration of resource consent applications.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S185.04.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-P12	Support primary submission	Support this submission in part. 3 storey building should only be developed in new areas, to reduce negative impacts on existing residential buildings.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S186	S186.01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	This submission opposes the boundary of Residential Intensification Precinct B extending north of Kapiti Road (identified as Precinct Golf-Manly in the submission), and seeks to restrict the area designated for 6 storeys to land where 6 storeys have already been constructed on Kapiti Road.  The submission opposes the reasons stated for establishing higher density housing, and that the reasons are not applicable, as follows: - DO-O3#1 aims to create efficient services and to integrate with the existing township. Due to high traffic on Kapiti Road, Precinct Golf-Manly will never be integrated into the township area. It is already difficult to cross Kapiti Road to visit the township. Current crossings are impractical and any change which increases traffic flows will also increase the danger to pedestrians and cyclists. - DO-O3#3. The Paraparaumu Beach town centre does not have high employment. If this is an important criterion then such zones should be established next to light industrial zones created in the district. The impact of COVID has resulted in more people working from home rather than in concentrated business areas. - DO-O3#4 aims to increase resilience and reduce risk to life or property from natural hazards. The Kapiti Road area is identified as a ponding area (see Takutai map assessments). These vulnerabilities further highlight the inability to integrate Precinct Golf-Manly into Precinct B. - DO-O3#6 notes the desire to protect the special character of the areas proposed to have a change in designation status. The Precinct Golf-Manly is on sand dunes with views to Kāpiti Island, the Tararua Ranges, and the Marlborough Sounds. Throughout these properties there are a variety of specimen trees which provide natural character and additional biodiversity values. - The Precinct Golf-Manly special character values plus the vulnerabilities of the Kapiti Road area make the integration of this area with the township area impractical. - The increased intensification of the Precinct Golf-Manly will not be able to achieved the hydraulic connectivity rules due to the dune complex terrain. In fact it is very likely that there will be a substantial increase in stormwater runoff due to the increase in impermeable surfaces. Recent rainfall data provided by GWRC highlight that the current stormwater arrangements will be grossly overwhelmed. - UFD-P3 - Clarify if the character values provide for the protection of iconic views.	Amend the boundary of Residential Intensification Precinct B to not extend north of Kapiti Road, and include this area in the General Residential area.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I understand that the submitter is referring to the extent of Residential Intensification Precinct B located to the north of the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone.  I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area to the north the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone.  I also note the following in response to the matters raised in the submission: - I do not consider Kāpiti Road to be a barrier to the area. There are pedestrian access routes available (to the west of the Manly Street roundabout) that avoid crossing Kāpiti Road; - I do not consider the level of employment available to be a primary consideration in the application of Policy 3(d). Rather, adjacency to a Town Centre Zone (that provides for commercial activities and community services) is the primary consideration, and I consider that the Paraparaumu Beach Town Centre Zone provides for the use and development of a range of commercial activities and community services to meet the needs of the surrounding community; - I note that District Plan rules that place restrictions on development in areas subject to identified flood hazards (including ponding areas) will continue to apply to development in the Residential Intensification Precinct; - In relation to hydraulic neutrality provisions, I note that subdivision to create new allotments (including for unit titles, such as apartments) is required to meet standards for hydraulic neutrality under the District Plan's subdivision rules (see rule SUB-DW-Rx1). I also note that the District Plan requires 30% of the total allotment area to be permeable (see rule GRZ-R1). - While I acknowledge that increased building heights may result in a change to the appearance or character of the area, and changes to other amenity values (such as access to views), this outcome is anticipated by Objective 4 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S186	S186.02	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	See submission point S186.01	Amend the height restrictions for the area on lower Kapiti Road, to the existing high rise building footprint.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested would be inconsistent with the requirement for the District Plan to give effect to Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD, which requires the District Plan to enable building heights of at least 6-storeys in this area (because it is located within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone).	Do not accept.	No.
S186	S186.03	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	See submission point S186.01	Amend the definition of 'special character' to protect views of the whole district.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S186	S186.04	Gunn, Ian and Jean	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	See submission point S186.01	Identify all flooding/ponding areas.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Flood hazard areas (including ponding areas) are identified in the District Plan maps.	Do not accept.	No.
S186	S186.05	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The qualifying coastal matter zone is narrow and doesn't include the lower reaches of the Tikotu Stream. In our experience the lower reaches of streams are vulnerable to incursions from the sea and flooding, and needs to be included in the zone.	Extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct inland to the entrance of the Paraparaumu Beach Golf Course.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	In relation to flood hazards, I consider this matter to be managed through the flood hazard provisions of the District Plan, which will continue to apply to development in the areas identified as being subject to flood hazard around the lower reaches of the Tikotu Stream.	Do not accept.	No.
S186.FS.1	S186.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Full submission	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S187	S187.01	Rudings, Mark	254-256 Main Highway and 4 Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose	The submitter owns property at 254-256 Main Highway and 4 Rahui Road, Ōtaki.  This submission relates to the properties adjacent to Main Highway/Mill Road, Rahui Road (submitter references a map they provided, but this was not attached). This submission is opposed to the application of PRECx2 to these properties for the following reasons: - Permitting this rezoning would allow for outcomes completely consistent and aligned with these defined and desired by the Proposed Centres Design Guide presented in Appendix D. - There is precedence. Historically, 254-256 Main Highway has been used as a commercial premises for over 20 years. Likewise, 258-260 Main Highway (including the adjacent 4 Rahui) has been used for commercial Visitor Accommodation for over 30 years. On the opposite side of Main Highway the properties at 282 and 284 Mill Road operate as commercial offices for a lawyer and an accountant (mixed-use with residential above). Taken together with BP on the south east corner of the intersection and ex-Sunrise Spa dealership to the south-west, the entire intersection currently operates commercial enterprise. Allowing these properties to be rezoned as Town Centre (or preferably MUZ) would be consistent with how these properties are currently (and historically) consented to be used. - The proposed residential zoning (PRECx2) for these sites, most specifically 254-256 Main Highway and 4 Rahui Road, would be less desirable than a mixed use or commercial zoning. They sit on a major thoroughfare beside a roundabout and a bridge, with a busy 24 hour petrol station opposite, a motel adjacent, and the railway and Expressway immediately behind. The submitter believes the quality of any pure residential development would be severely compromised. Further, the subject sites are within a ponding zone, further compounding residential development issues. - A mixed use or commercial zoning would allow for development of modern commercial premises (or preferably mixed use developments) beyond the prevalent retail premises which will be required as Ōtaki township expands. It would also allow for more effective utilisation of land in this location.	Rezone the properties adjacent to Main Highway/Mill Road (identified on the map) to MUZ (or equivalent) or TCZ.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	The submitter has requested the rezoning of three land parcels from the proposed General Residential Zone (PRECx2) in PC(N) to Town Centre Zone. They have provided specific reasoning, including the fact that the sites are currently used (and consented) for commercial purposes, they are located within close proximity of other commercial Town Centre zoned land uses, and within close proximity of major transport corridors. I therefore consider it appropriate to rezone these sites as Town Centre Zone as requested.  The amendments provide for a more appropriate zoning for the subject sites, while still enabling residential development that would have been provided for by the proposed zoning in PC(N), ensuring consistency with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Accept. By rezoning the sites to Town Centre Zone.	Yes. Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.14 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider the proposed amendments are a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, given the sites location, existing uses and proximity to the bulk of the Town Centre zoned properties in Ōtaki. This rezoning supports incorporating the MDRS into the District Plan.
S203.FS.1	S187.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	254-256 Main Highway and 4 Rahui Road, Ōtaki	Oppose primary submission	KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S188	S188.01	HW Developments Ltd	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Not specified	<p>The submission relates to a site which is subject to a subdivision consent to amalgamate it into the adjacent site at 237 Rangiu Road. The subdivision consent was granted in June 2022. A resource consent for an 84 lot residential subdivision has been granted for the amalgamated allotment. The resource consent for the residential subdivision shows that the development will be accessed from Rangiu Road.</p> <p>The submission seeks that the part of the site was amalgamated into 237 Rangiu Road be included within PREC2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) on the basis that it is now accessed by 237 Rangiu Road, which is within the 400m walkable distance of the Town Centre Zone.</p> <p>The submission identifies other reasons in support of the submission, including (but not limited to): the proximity of the site to the Town Centre Zone, facilitating cohesive urban form outcomes, low constraints on the site, the ability to service the site with existing or planned infrastructure, and development with a strong potential to be realised.</p> <p>The submission states that the changes sought have the potential to give effect to several policies in the NPS-UD.</p>	Amend the boundary of PREC2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) to include the land which was formerly Section 75 Block IX Waitohu SD (identified in Figure 5, page 8 of the original submission).	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	Yes. Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.10 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report.
S189	S189.01	Aregger, Petra	14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae	Not specified	<p>The submission relates to the exclusion 14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae from rezoning as part of PC2.</p> <p>The submission seeks rezoning of the site for several reasons, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The current rural zoning appears overly restrictive in the context of the area. There is limited potential for production activity on the site or surrounding sites.</li> <li>- Existing public infrastructure in the area can readily support development.</li> <li>- The site is accessible from Greenaway Road.</li> <li>- Flood risk on the site can indicatively be managed efficiently.</li> <li>- The site is located between two established and increasingly urbanised areas.</li> <li>- Rezoning the site would contribute to a cohesive local pattern of residential development.</li> <li>- Constraints such as the reverse sensitivity with the expressway, flood hazards and liquefaction can be managed.</li> <li>- The site would not require a structure plan approach.</li> <li>- The site would provide a modest yet notable contribution to housing supply, with a strong potential to be realised.</li> <li>- The inclusion of the site as part of the residential zone would contribute to the implementation of NPS-UD policies and have wider benefits for the community in providing future development potential.</li> </ul>	Rezone 14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	Do not accept.	No.
S053.FS.1	S189.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	<p>The proposed rezoning of land is next to an expressway. The health and amenity to future occupants living next to the expressway should be considered and managed, as well as access arrangements.</p> <p>Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.</p>	<p>Disallow primary submission.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.</p>	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S189.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae	Support primary submission	<p>Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.</p>	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S189.01.FS03	Atiawa ki Whakarongotai	14 Greenaway Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	<p>These sites are subject to flooding risk. They should therefore not be prioritised for rezoning as part of this PC2.</p> <p>KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.</p> <p>The east side of the site referenced in S208.01 and S189.01 sit in the Tukurākau Heritage site. Any future proposals for the Takamore and Tukurākau precincts would require in depth assessment with mana whenua given their history.</p> <p>Retain existing zoning</p>	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190	S190.01	Tselentis, Evangella	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	<p>The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons.</li> <li>- The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD.</li> <li>- PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.</li> <li>- The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions.</li> <li>- The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years.</li> <li>- PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA.</li> <li>- The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities.</li> <li>- Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions.</li> <li>- Policies 6, 7 &amp; 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts.</li> <li>- The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA.</li> <li>- Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character".</li> <li>- Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character"</li> <li>- The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA.</li> <li>- The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA.</li> <li>- Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character.</li> <li>- It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or</li> <li>the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps (<a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a>).</li> </ol> <p>Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.</p>	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S190.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the District Plan Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged. We agree the most residents would consider allowing higher development along the Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. We agree that Kapiti Coast District Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting that in our iwi perspective the entire coastline is considered 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We support the reference that it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S190	S190.02	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S190.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S190	S190.03	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S190.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S190	S190.04	Tselentis, Evangelia Leah	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S191	S191.01	Lambert, Nicholas	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc00c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc00c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S203.FS.1	S191.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged. We also agree that most residents would consider allowing higher development along the Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. We agree that Council is required to preserve remaining natural character. In addition we note that in our iwi perspective the coastline should all be consider 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by climate change and coastal hazards within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and precautionary decision making.  The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S191	S191.02	Lambert, Nicholas	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S191.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S191	S191.03	Lambert, Nicholas	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S191.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.
S191	S191.04	Lambert, Nicholas	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S192	S192.01	Stevenson-Wright, Margaret	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A (Waikanae)	Oppose	This submission is opposed to the extent of the proposed PRECx1 for Waikanae and the application of the MDRS to the General Residential Zone in Waikanae, for the following reasons: - Completely block the view of the hills and significantly reduce the green space. - Sensitivity to the effects of development should be allowed for all in Waikanae, not just in the Marae Takiwā Precinct. - Waikanae is not a rapid transit stop, when the majority of passenger journeys on the train take two hours. - Proposed changes should explicitly respect everyone's home and their immediate surroundings.	Reduce the extent of PRECx1 for Waikanae to be within 400m walking distance from the Waikanae Station.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD to reduce the size of Residential Intensification Precinct A around the Waikanae train station. I note that Ministry for the Environment guidance on implementing the intensification provisions of the NPS-UD considers 800 metres to be the minimum size walkable catchment for use by Tier 1 local authorities implementing Policy 3(c) (see Ministry for the Environment (2020). <i>Understanding and implementing intensification provisions for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development</i> , pp.23-24).  I also note the following in response to the matters raised in the submission: - Waikanae train station is a rapid transit stop because it is served by the Kāpiti Line commuter rail service (which, as outlined at pages 51 and 52 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report, is provided for as a rapid transit service under the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and Wellington Regional Public Transport Plan). - While I acknowledge that increased building heights may result in a change to the appearance or character of the area, and changes to other amenity values (such as access to views), this outcome is anticipated by Objective 4 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S192.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	PRECx1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A (Waikanae)	Support primary submission	Support this submission. The majority of delays are caused by rail infrastructure issues south of Paekakariki, so this applies to the whole Kapiti Coast. It applies more the further north one is from Wellington.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S192	S192.02	Stevenson-Wright, Margaret	General	Oppose	See submission point S192.01.	Restrict the MDRS rules to ensure some view of the hills and green space is maintained for buildings that currently have it in Waikanae.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S192	S192.03	Stevenson-Wright, Margaret	General	Oppose	See submission point S192.01.	Retain the existing Waikanae special zoning areas in the interim, with the MDRS intensification rules experimentally applied to the non-precinct general residential areas until issues and problems with the MDRS intensification can be fully appreciated and handled.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S193	S193.01	Lambert, William	General	Oppose	The submission is in full support of the submissions made by Pat Duignan (S105 and S106) and Glen Wiggs (S098).	That full consideration is given to the submissions of Pat Duignan (S105 and S106) and Glen Wiggs (S098) and the important points raised regarding the impact of the proposals on the Kāpiti Coast area and community.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to S098, S105 and S106.	Refer to S098, S105 and S106.	Refer to S098, S105 and S106.
S194	S194.01	Curtis, Felicity	General	Oppose	The submission opposes the application of the MDRS at Peka Peka Beach, on the basis that the area suffers from a lack of services (in particular storm water). The submission states that Peka Peka Beach has no stormwater provision and over the recent months from December 2021, it has suffered from ground water level rise and flooding.	While no specific decision is requested on the provisions of Plan Change 2, the submission opposes the application of the MDRS at Peka Peka beach.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Because it meets the definition of a <i>relevant residential zone</i> , I consider that the MDRS must be applied to the General Residential Zone at Peka Peka Beach (except in areas where a qualifying matter applies). However, I note that I have made recommendations to extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (which is the area where the MDRS would not be applied as part of PC2) at Peka Peka Beach in response to submissions on this matter (refer specifically to submission point S098.03).	Do not accept.	No.
S195	S195.01	Campbell, Josephine	General	Not specified	The submitter supports the submissions of Pat Duignan (Waikanae Beach Residents Society (S105) and William Glen Turner (S098).	Refer to S105 and S098.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to S098 and S105.	Refer to S098 and S105.	Refer to S098 and S105.
S196	S196.01	Ryman Healthcare Limited	General	Not specified	This submission supports the submission made by the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA) (refer S197). Ryman adopts the RVA's submission on PC2. In addition, Ryman wishes to emphasise that PC2 will have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for Kāpiti's growing ageing population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region.	Refer to S197.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to S197.	Refer to S197.	Refer to S197.
S100.FS.1	S196.01.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	General	Support primary submission	Ātiawa supports the provision of housing and care facilities within retirement villages. We recognise the unique nature of those facilities and the role they play in communities. We also recognise that they form part of the community and, as with other activities they have effects that need to be assessed and avoided, remedies or mitigated. Ātiawa therefore oppose the proposal to exempt retirement villages from design criteria, enable increased densities and preclude notification. Recognise, within PC2, the role of retirement villages within our communities and provide design criteria or require structure plans relevant to the activity.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S197	S197.01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Definitions – Retirement Unit	Not specified	The RVA considers that a 'retirement unit' definition is required in the District Plan as a result of its submissions on Plan Change 2 to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	Add the following 'retirement unit' definition to the District Plan: <b>Retirement Unit</b> means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	All provisions	Oppose	The RVA opposes the inclusion of lengthy explanation text within PC2. It considers the planning direction should be clearly set out in the operative provisions. Explanation text has no clear role and increases interpretation uncertainties.	Delete the explanation text throughout PC2 with relevant text to be integrated into the operative provisions.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider that PC2 includes lengthy explanation text. Rather I consider that PC2 amends existing explanation text to ensure that it is consistent with the requirement to incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.03	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-O3	Support	The RVA supports DO-O3 to the extent it is consistent with the NPSUD and MDRS. The RVA opposes the objective to the extent it fails to recognise the need to provide for retirement villages in all residential zones, not just near centres and transport corridors. The RVA considers this policy needs to recognise and provide for the housing and care needs of the ageing population for the reasons set out in the submission. The RVA considers this policy also needs to recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the General Residential Zone for the reasons set out in the submission.	Amend DO-O3 to address any conflicts with the NPSUD or MDRS and to provide for retirement villages in all residential zones. Add the following clauses to DO-O3: <b>4. residential development that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population;</b> <b>5. residential development that recognises the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites by providing for more efficient use of those sites;</b>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.04	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-Ox1	Support	The RVA supports DO-Ox1 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS.	Retain DO-Ox1 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.05	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-Ox2	Support	The RVA supports DO-Ox2 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS.	Retain DO-Ox2 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S197	S197.06	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-Ox3	Support	The RVA supports DO-Ox3 to the extent it aligns with NPSUD Policy 3. The RVA considers the objective is inconsistent with the direction in Policy 3 to provide for building heights of "at least" 6 storeys in relevant locations.	Amend DO-Ox2 to refer to buildings of "at least" 6 storeys (not "up to").	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that DO-Ox3, DO-O16 and UFD-Px are consistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.  The requirement under Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD to "enable... buildings of at least 6-storeys" means that the District Plan must enable 6-storey buildings, or alternatively may enable buildings that are taller than 6-storeys. I consider that because DO-Ox3 and DO-O16 enable buildings that are 6-storeys, this achieves the requirement under Policy 3(c) that the District Plan must enable buildings of at least 6 storeys.  Further, I consider that replacing the term "up to" with "at least" would provide no certainty to District Plan users about the building heights sought to be enabled by the Plan, as it would have the effect of enabling unlimited building height. Further, I consider it would have the effect of dis-abling buildings that are less than the specified height, because those buildings would not be "at least" that height. This may be counterproductive in terms of achieving the housing variety sought by the MDRS and the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.07	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-O11	Oppose in part	The RVA supports the recognition that the character and amenity of the District will change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations as this is consistent with Objective 4 of the NPSUD. However, the RVA opposes the drafting of this objective which qualifies and dilutes the direction in Objective 4 of the NPSUD.	Amend DO-O11 to read as follows: <u>DO-O11 Character and Amenity Values</u> <u>To provide for the character and amenity values of the District's urban environments to develop, and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations.</u>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider DO-O11, as amended by PC2, to be consistent with objective 4 of the NPS-UD. Specifically, DO-O11 requires recognition (as opposed to maintenance and enhancement) of character an amenity values, while providing for character and amenity values to develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations (which is the matter sought by the submitter). I therefore do not consider it to be necessary to replace DO-O11 with the objective requested by the submitter.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.08	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-O12	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes this objective to the extent that it is inconsistent with the MDRS, by referencing concepts such as 'suitable urban and rural locations' and 'enhancing the amenity of living environments', and considers it must be amended for the reasons set out in its submission above.	Delete DO-O12 or amend for consistency with the MDRS.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider DO-O12 to be inconsistent with the MDRS, and I note that this provision was not notified as part of PC2.  In relation to "suitable urban and rural locations", I note that rural locations are not relevant to the MDRS, and read alongside objective DO-Ox2, suitable urban locations can be taken to mean <i>relevant residential zones</i> (which in the case of the Kapiti Coast District Plan is the General Residential Zone).  In relation to "enhancing the amenity value of living environments", because the objective does not seek that amenity values are maintained, I consider that this can be reconciled with the outcome sought by Objective 4 of the NPS-UD (which is that amenity values develop and change over time to meet the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations).	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.09	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	DO-O16	Oppose in part	The RVA supports the provision in DO-O16 for a higher density urban built character in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, Town Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone and Local Centre Zone. However, the RVA considers the objective is inconsistent with the direction in Policy 3 to provide for building heights of "at least" 6 storeys in relevant locations.	Amend DO-O16 to refer to buildings of "at least" the relevant number of storeys (not "up to").	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to my assessment under submission point S197.06.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.10	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UED1-P1	Oppose in part	The RVA suggests UEDI-P1 requires amendment to align with the MDRS. It promotes "quality urban design outcomes" which is a vague concept that is not defined in the Plan.	Delete UEDI-P1 or amend for consistency with the MDRS.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider UEDI-P1 to be inconsistent with the MDRS. The MDRS do not prevent a District Plan from promoting quality urban development outcomes, so long as the permitted activity status of development that complies with the density standards outlined in Schedule 3A to the RMA are provided for. I also note that MDRS policy 5 (which is outlined under clause 6(e) of Schedule 3A to the RMA) provides for the encouragement of high-quality development.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.11	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UED1-P2	Support in part	The RVA does not oppose a requirement in UEDI-P2 for development to "consider" the CPTED guidelines, but opposes the use of the word "consistent" in relation to guidelines. The RVA opposes the requirement for development to be consistent with the Land Development Minimum Requirements, which are not suitable for all developments. The document makes only one mention of 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).	Amend UEDI-P2 as follows: <u>The design of development, use and subdivision will consider be consistent with the Land Development Minimum Requirements and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Guidelines to enhance safety and security of residents and visitors.</u>	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	PC(N) replaces the reference to the SDPR with the LDMR in this policy, but it does not propose to change the wording of the policy. If there are matters contained in the LDMR that are not relevant to retirement villages (in other words, where there are matters in the LDMR that retirement villages do not need to be consistent with because they are not relevant), I consider it most appropriate that these are addressed through a resource consent process.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.12	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-Px	Oppose in part	The RVA supports UFD-Px and its provisions for heights and densities of urban form that enable more people to live in the District's urban environments in accordance with the provisions of the NPSUD Policy 3. However, the RVA considers the objective is inconsistent with the direction in Policy 3 to provide for building heights of "at least" 6 storeys in relevant locations. It is also inconsistent with the direction in the MDRS for the planned urban built character to "include" 3-storey buildings.	Amend UFD-Px to refer to buildings of "at least" or "including" (as relevant) the relevant number of storeys (not "up to").	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to my assessment under submission point S197.06.  In relation to whether it is necessary to use the term "including", I consider that a policy that enables buildings "up to" a specified height inherently includes buildings of the specified height. If the policy was not intended to enable buildings including the specified height, it would use the words "less than" rather than "up to". I therefore consider it unnecessary to add "including" to the policy.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.13	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-Px	Oppose in part	The RVA also opposes the direction to "avoid" inappropriate buildings, activities, heights and densities in qualifying matter areas. In many qualifying matter areas, intensification can occur, albeit some additional mitigation may be required.	Amend UFD-Px to refer to "managing" inappropriate buildings, activities, heights and densities (not "avoiding").	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I consider that my assessment and recommendations in response to submission point S207.03 address the matter raised by the submitter.	Accept in part. Refer to S207.03 for details.	Yes. Amend UFD-Px. Refer section 2.1 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the evaluation under S207.03.
S197	S197.14	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P1	Oppose in part	The RVA supports UFD-P1 and its provision for new urban development for residential activities in existing urban areas and identified growth areas, in a manner providing for a variety of housing types and densities and enabling increased housing densities. The RVA considers however that the 'maintaining' of a consolidated urban form within existing urban areas and a limited number of identified growth areas contradicts DO-O3 which also provides for the development of new urban areas. Without inclusion of provisions for the development of new urban areas, UFD-P1 will present a restriction to urban development that contradicts the MDRS.	Amend UFD-P1 to acknowledge and provide for the development of new urban areas, and to ensure consistency with the MDRS.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree that UFD-P1 is not consistent with DO-O3 (as amended by PC2), and I have made recommendations in response to submission point S023.06 to amend UFD-P1 address this.	Accept.	Yes. Amend UFD-P1. Refer to section 2.2 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to submission point S023.06.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.15	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P2	Support in part	The RVA supports UFD-P2 and its encouraging of an increased mix of housing forms and types which cater for increased variety and densities of housing (including housing for older persons), and a range of allotment sizes and land tenure arrangements to facilitate these typologies.  The RVA considers that alongside 'housing for older persons', retirement villages should be specifically identified as being provided for. The term 'housing for older persons' is not defined in the District Plan, whereas the term 'retirement village' is defined in the National Planning Standards.  The RVA considers the reference to "encouraging high amenity values" in this Policy does not recognise that the amenity values within those parts of the District where an increased mix of housing forms and types are encouraged will change over time, in line with Objective 4 NPSUD and DO-O11. It also does not implement MDRS Policy 5 regarding "encouraging high-quality development".	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P2 to ensure consistency with the MDRS and to include specific reference to retirement villages in UFD-P2: <b>UFD-P2 Housing Choice</b> An increased mix of housing forms and types will be encouraged within parts of the District where increased variety and densities of housing are able to cater for changing demographics, while encouraging high quality development amenity values. This will include provision for: 1. ... 2. Housing for older persons; <b>2A. Retirement villages;</b>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the request to replace 'amenity values' with 'high quality development', I agree with the submitter that this is consistent with MDRS policy 5 (clause 6(2)(e) of Schedule 3A of the RMA).	<b>Accept in part.</b> Replace 'amenity values' with 'high quality development'.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P2. Refer section 2.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA than the notified provision because the amendment is consistent with the wording of MDRS policy 5 (clause 6(2)(e) of Schedule 3A of the RMA).
S197	S197.16	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P3	Support in part	The RVA considers this policy is unclear as it is not clear how residential intensification is to "give consideration to" effects on character and amenity values. It also fails to recognise that the character and amenity of the District will change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations. The RVA considers PC2 must give clear guidance as to the role of density standards in informing the assessment of effects as set out in the submission.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P3 as follows to integrate recognition that the character and amenity of the District will change over time: <b>UFD-P3 Managing Intensification</b> <u>Residential intensification will give consideration to the effects of subdivision and development on character and amenity values will be assessed where these are provided for in the District Plan, while recognising that the character and amenity of the District will change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations.</u>  <b>Add the following policy:</b> <u>Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to the amendments requested to UFD-P3, I generally agree with the submitter and consider that the amendments requested generally improve the interpretation of the policy. I have however made amendments to the text requested to ensure that the policy continues to be focussed on residential intensification (rather than subdivision and development generally).  However, I disagree that a policy needs to be provided to enable the density standards to be utilised as a "baseline". The MDRS density standards are incorporated into the permitted activity rule for buildings and structures in the General Residential Zone (GRZ-Rx1), and as such, the permitted baseline approach for the assessment of effects provided for by sections 95E(2)(a) and 104(2) of the RMA is already enabled.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend UFD-P2 using similar wording to that requested by the submitter, but retaining a focus on residential intensification.  Reject the request for a new policy specifying the role of density standards.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P3. Refer to section 2.4 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2, because it provides for improved interpretation of the policy, and better recognises Objective 4 of the NPS-UD.
S197	S197.17	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P4	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes UFD-P4 as it fails to recognise the functional and operational requirements of retirement villages and the different forms and densities of development associated with retirement villages.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P4 to refer to an area specific approach "generally" applying. <b>Add</b> a retirement village-specific policy as set out below.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.18	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P7	Oppose in part	The RVA considers that, as currently phrased, UFD-P7 is inconsistent with the MDRS and presents a barrier / restriction to the level of intensification sought by the Enabling Housing Act noting that changes to zoning in the District provide for / enable greater intensification in all appropriately zoned areas regardless of their proximity to public open space. It also fails to recognise that retirement villages provide communal open spaces on site.	<b>Delete</b> UFD-P7.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider this policy to be inconsistent with the MDRS for several reasons. Firstly, I do not consider the policy to be inconsistent with any of the MDRS policies outlined in clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA. Nor do I consider it to be sufficiently directive to preclude development that is located greater than 400 metres from an open space. Secondly, where development is located greater than 400m from a public open space, I consider that this policy is generally achieved by the financial contributions provisions of the District Plan, which require new residential units (including those that are permitted activity) to pay a financial contribution towards the provision of reserves and open space, which in turn enables the Council to provide new or improved reserves and open space that contribute towards achieving this policy. Finally, in relation to development that is of a greater density than permitted by the MDRS (in other words, development with 4 or more dwellings), I consider this policy may be a relevant consideration for the design of development (including whether public open space should be incorporated into the development). This would be particularly relevant for subdivision consents located greater than 400m from a public open space.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.19	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P11	Oppose in part	The RVA considers UFD-P11 is unclear as to when it applies. It should only apply to development within areas of significant/national importance or reserves. The RVA supports the policy's provisions for undertaking development in a manner that considers effects on the amenity values while recognising that these values will develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P11 to clarify that it only applies to development within areas that have been identified in the plan as areas of significant/national importance or reserves.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that because of the use of the term "identified" in clause 2, that clause 1 of the policy is intended to be read as applying to those areas identified in the District Plan as being significant. However I accept the submitter's position that the policy is not entirely clear about this. I consider that amending clause 1 of the policy to clarify that it relates to those areas identified in the District Plan as being significant would improve interpretation of the policy and provide greater certainty about where the clause will be applied.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P11. Refer to section 2.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for improved interpretation of the policy and greater certainty about where the policy is intended to be applied.
S197	S197.20	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	UFD-P11	Oppose in part	The RVA queries why PC2 uses the General Residential Zone and a Residential Intensification precinct, rather than the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone in line with the National Planning Standards and other plan changes under the Enabling Housing Act.	<b>Adopt</b> a zoning framework based on the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.21	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TR-P1	Oppose in part	The RVA considers the policy is inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act which does not require development to be located based on the transport network hierarchy.	<b>Amend</b> policy to achieve consistency with the MDRS.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I do not consider this policy to be contrary to or inconsistent with the requirements of Schedule 3A of the RMA (the MDRS).	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.22	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TR-P2	Oppose in part	The RVA supports TR-P2's provisions for the integration of development with a transport system that offers a wide range of travel mode choices, which connects residents to essential community services, centres and social infrastructure. The RVA considers however that the list of measures through which sustainable transport and maximised mode choice are to be achieved are not relevant / necessary for all developments, and as such the policy should be amended to reflect this.  The RVA also opposes the requirement in (5) applying to retirement villages given the lower levels of traffic generated by retirement villages compared to standard development.	<b>Amend</b> TR-P2 as follows to acknowledge that not all measures listed in the policy are relevant / necessary for all developments: <b>TR-P2 Sustainable Transport and Maximising Mode Choice</b> Development and subdivision will be integrated with a transport system that offers encourages a wide range of travel mode choices, which and the connections of residents to essential community services, centres and social infrastructure, through measures such as: ... ...	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I consider the amendments requested have the potential to reduce the effectiveness of the policy, and I do not consider that they are necessary in order to incorporate the MDRS or give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD into the District Plan.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.23	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TR-R10	Oppose in part	Retirement villages typically generate vpd exceeding 200 vpd in Working Zones, and / or 100 vpd in all other zones, so would meet the definition of 'major traffic activity(ies)'. The RVA considers regulation of trip generation should be based on peak hour movements, not daily movements, as peak movements are what affects capacity. Further, the policy should recognise that trip generation from a site is an anticipated component of development and the focus of regulation should be on higher than anticipated trip generation. The RVA considers the matters of discretion are overly broad and should be focused on the particular effects of relevance to exceeding the standard.	<b>Amend</b> TR-R10 to provide a peak hour vehicle movement standard.  <b>Amend</b> TR-R10 so the matters of discretion require consideration of whether the development generates the same or less traffic than anticipated by the site zoning. <b>Remove</b> broad and unclear matters of discretion.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I do not consider this rule to be contrary to or inconsistent with the requirements of Schedule 3A of the RMA (the MDRS) or Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S053.FS.1	S197.23.FS01	Waka Kotahi	TR-R10	Oppose primary submission	Waka Kotahi opposes the changes sought, and considers that both peak and daily trip generation triggers are relevant. It is appropriate that Retirement Villages are classified as major traffic activities where daily vehicle movements exceed the permitted trip generation.	Disallow primary submission point.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S197	S197.24	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Financial Contributions	Oppose in part	<p>The RVA opposes the use of dual financial and development contributions regimes due to the risk of double dipping. It supports the use of a financial contributions regime, if the development contributions regime is removed.</p> <p>The RVA supports the various statements in the introduction to the Financial Contributions chapter, FC-R5 and in Table x2 that suggest double dipping will not occur. However, it considers the overlap between the regimes creates a high risk of double dipping.</p> <p>The RVA is concerned that the Financial Contributions Chapter does not clearly set out the financial contributions that will be required, with costs having to be calculated for each individual development based on matters for consideration rather than a clear formula.</p> <p>The Chapter also does not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages or the need to provide credit for works carried out as part of development.</p>	<p>Amend the financial contributions provisions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure the dual financial and development contributions regimes will not result in double dipping;</li> <li>- Provide certainty as to the financial contributions that will be required to be paid;</li> <li>- Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works undertaken as part of development; and</li> <li>- Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.</li> </ul>	4.17 Financial Contributions	<p>I do not consider that there is an overlap between the development contributions and financial contributions regimes. I note that the introduction to the Financial Contributions chapter states: "The Council takes development contributions in most circumstances rather than financial contributions. As such financial contributions will generally only be required where the Development Contributions Policy does not apply or where the Development Contributions Policy does not address the type of adverse effects generated by the development or activity."</p> <p>I do not consider that there is a risk of development contributions and financial contributions being charged for the same purpose (or 'double dipping') because such an outcome is explicitly precluded by section 200(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 2002. I also note that this outcome is precluded by standard 2 of rule FC-R5.</p> <p>I consider that the amendments to PC2 improve certainty because they outline (under rules FC-R5, FC-R6, FC-R7 and FC-Table x2) the matters to be considered when determining the level of financial contribution to be paid.</p> <p>I consider that the costs of works undertaken as part of development would be considered under standards 1 and 2 of rule FC-R6.</p> <p>Regarding any substantially lower demand profile associated with retirement villages, I consider that where it is demonstrated that there is lower demand, this would be considered under the matters outlined in table FC-Table x2 (which reference additional generated demand).</p>	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.25	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General Residential Zone: Introduction	Multiple positions	<p>The RVA supports the general description provided in the General Residential Zone that outlines where higher density development can be expected to occur. However, it considers that as currently phrased the description is inconsistent with the MDRS and presents a barrier / restriction to the level of intensification sought by the Enabling Housing Act, by providing for higher densities of development in areas 'well served by public transport' or in areas that 'are close to a range of commercial activities and community services'. The RVA acknowledges these requirements are based off the NPSUD, but suggests that if not included verbatim from the NPSUD they will lead to interpretation issues and unnecessarily restrict the level of intensification anticipated under the MDRS.</p> <p>The RVA opposes the reference to the design guidelines as they make no reference to retirement villages, and provide 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). The RVA considers that retirement villages can be of a 'high standard' without being consistent with the design guidelines.</p> <p>The RVA submits the reference to encouraging new development to 'contribute positively' to the changing character of the Zone is not a requirement of the MDRS. Furthermore, the RVA submits it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of a 'well-functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive/beneficial matters and is already referred to in the Introductory section. It is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.</p>	<p>Amend the second paragraph of the General Residential Zone introduction as follows: <u>A mix of housing densities are provided for throughout the Zone, with higher densities enabled in areas including those that are well served by public transport or are close to a range of commercial activities and community services or where services and amenities can be provided for within the development.</u></p> <p>Amend the third paragraph of the General Residential Zone introduction as follows: <u>It is anticipated that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the Zone will change over time. Where appropriate, design guidelines help manage this change by promoting a high standard of urban design and encouraging new development to contribute positively to the changing character of the Zone.</u></p>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	<p>I disagree with the amendments requested to the second paragraph of the General Residential Zone introduction. The intent of this text is to describe how the zone intends to enable greater levels of development near centres zones and rapid transit stops, in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. The amendments requested suggest that services are intended to be developed to a greater degree within the General Residential Zone itself (as part of development). This is not the case. The provisions of the General Residential Zone seek that residential activities are the principle activity provided for, with "services and amenities" (which I take to be the equivalent of commercial activities and community services described by the NPS-UD) generally sought to be provided in the centres zones. I therefore consider the amendments requested to the second paragraph to be inconsistent with the purpose of the zone.</p> <p>I agree with the amendments requested to the third paragraph. While I disagree with the submitters position in relation to the Design Guides (which in relation to the submitters submission points on this matter), I consider that the amended text requested by the submitter is consistent with the consideration of the Residential Design Guide only in relation to resource consent applications for development of 4 or more residential units. I consider that this amendment would provide for greater consistency between the introductory text and the provisions of the zone chapter.</p>	Accept in part. By accepting the requested amendments to the text of the third paragraph of the introductory text to the General Residential Zone chapter.	Yes. Amend the introductory text to the General Residential Zone chapter introduction. Refer to section 4.1 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it that this amendment would provides for greater consistency between the introductory text and the provisions of the zone chapter (which incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD).
S197	S197.26	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px1	Support	The RVA supports GRZ-Px1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain GRZ-Px1 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S197	S197.27	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px2	Support	The RVA supports GRZ-Px2 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS.	Retain GRZ-Px2 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S197	S197.28	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px3	Support	The RVA supports GRZ-Px3 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain GRZ-Px3 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S197	S197.29	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px4	Support	The RVA supports GRZ-Px4 as it aligns with Policy 4 of the MDRS.	Retain GRZ-Px4 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S197	S197.30	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px5	Support	The RVA supports GRZ-Px5 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain GRZ-Px5 as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S197	S197.31	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px6	Oppose in part	The RVA supports GRZ-Px6 in principle in terms of providing for higher-density housing, however it considers that outcome should be achieved through the High Density Residential Zone.	Apply the High Density Residential Zone, rather than precincts.	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.32	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Px6, Design Guides	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the requirement to meet the needs of the Residential Design Guide, which 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).  In this regard, retirement villages should be considered against the built form standards they do not comply with. The Residential Design Guide does not align with the expectations under the NPSUD or Enabling Housing Act.	Amend GRZ-Px6 to remove the reference to developments meeting the requirements of the Residential Design Guide.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept. Although I note that the recommendation to amend GRZ-Px6 may partially provide for the relief sought by the submitter. Refer submission point S122.20.	No.
S197	S197.33	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P9	Oppose in part	The RVA supports GRZ-P9 and its provision for residential activities that include the provision of housing types which meet the need of households (4). However, the RVA opposes: Clause 2, which refers to development being "compatible" with the planned built character, rather than "responding to" the planned built character in line with MDRS objective 2. Clause 5, which seeks for the number of residential units per allotment to be limited, being restrictive in nature (particularly for activities such as retirement villages which typically comprise of multiple residential units), which does not align with the intensification purpose of the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend Clause 2 of GRZ-P9 to replace "compatible with" with "responds to" and remove Clause 5 from GRZ-P9 to remove reference to the limiting of the number of residential units per allotment.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree with the submitter that the wording of clause 2 should be consistent with MDRS objective 2 (which is outlined under clause 6(1)(b) of Schedule 3A to the RMA, and provided for under proposed objective DO-Ox2). I consider that this would require a consequential amendment to clause 4 of policy GRZ-P10 (which provides for a similar matter using similar terms) to ensure consistency between the policies.  I note that I have recommended that the reference to limiting the number of residential units per allotment under clause 5 be removed in response to submission point S207.12.	Accept.  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves consistency of the policy with MDRS objective 2 (outlined under clause 6(1)(b) of Schedule 3A to the RMA).	Yes. Amend GRZ-P9. Refer section 4.13 of PC(R1). Amend GRZ-P10. Refer section 4.14 of PC(R1).
S197	S197.34	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P10	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes in part GRZ-P10 and its requirement to achieve a high level of on-site amenity beyond the requirements of the MDRS. The regulation of on-site amenity within a retirement village is opposed, as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the needs of its residents. Internal amenity matters are also covered by the MDRS provisions and Council cannot seek to impose more stringent requirements. The RVA's members 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.  The policy also fails to recognise the functional and operational requirements of retirement villages, for example by clause 2 referring to "private" outdoor living space and not "communal" space.	Amend GRZ-P10 to acknowledge that the residential amenity principles do not apply to retirement villages. A retirement-village specific policy and rule framework (see below) will encourage high quality retirement village development.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.35	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P11	Oppose in part	The RVA considers this policy is inconsistent with Policy 3 of the MDRS, and covers matters included under GRZ-Px3. Amendments are required to remove the conflict. Development should not be required to be undertaken "in accordance with" a Guideline document.	Delete GRZ-P11, or amend GRZ-P11 to align with the MDRS.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider policy GRZ-P11 to be inconsistent with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. GRZ-P11 relates to streetscape matters, and does not have the effect of limiting the building heights that must be enabled by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. In any case, policy GRZ-P11 was not notified as part of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.36	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P12	Oppose in part	The RVA supports GRZ-P12 to the extent it is consistent with the landscaping requirements in the MDRS.  However, the RVA considers that the phrasing of GRZ-P12 generates requirements for residential developments that go beyond those set out in the MDRS. The RVA considers that rather than 'requiring' these landscaping matters, they should be 'encouraged'.	The RVA seeks to amend GRZ-P12 as follows to change the 'requirement' level of landscaping matters to be an 'encouragement' of landscaping matters. <u>GRZ-P12 Landscaping</u> <u>Landscaping will be required for non-residential activities and residential development in the Residential Zones to enhance residential amenity, while promoting water conservation and biodiversity and allowing for the natural infiltration of surface water through permeable treatments, in accordance with the density standards. Encourage landscaping will to be located and designed in accordance with the following principles:</u> 1. ...	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider the matters outlined in the policy to be inconsistent with the MDRS. The MDRS require at least 20% of the site area to be set aside for landscaping, and I consider the principles outlined in the policy to be relevant to the assessment of resource consent applications where the landscape area standard is not met.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.37	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P13	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes this policy to the extent that it seeks to manage development in the GRZ in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS (which does not include energy efficiency requirements), as the policy may have the effect of limiting residential development, particularly retirement village development. It is considered that the retention of this policy and its continued application to retirement villages within the GRZ creates a conflict with the MDRS.	The RVA seeks that GRZ-P13 is deleted.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider policy GRZ-P13 (which relates to energy efficiency) to be inconsistent with the MDRS. The MDRS do not preclude District Plan policies on energy efficiency, and I do not consider that policy GRZ-P13 has the effect of limiting the level of development to less than that required to be provided for as a permitted activity the MDRS. I further note that the matters outlined in the policy are to be applied "where practicable", which I consider provides flexibility for the policy to be applied in a manner that recognises practical constraints. In any case, Policy GRZ-P13 was not notified as part of PC2.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.38	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P16	Oppose in part	The RVA supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific policy in the General Residential Zone but considers the policy needs to be amended to apply to retirement villages as a whole, and not just retirement accommodation (which is specified to be a subcategory of retirement village). The RVA opposes retirement villages being bundled with various forms of "supported living accommodation".  The RVA considers the policy is in conflict with the MDRS and therefore needs to be amended as part of the PC2 process. In particular, clause 3 of the policy conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act, noting that the MDRS provisions enable greater intensification that would be limited by a need for development to 'reflect the residential nature and character of the location'.  The RVA considers GRZ-P16 must give effect to the direction under the 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.  The RVA also considers GRZ-P16 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.	Add a new retirement village policy: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.39	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-P16	Oppose in part	See submission point S197.38.	Alternatively to S197.38, <b>amend</b> GRZ-P16 as follows to align the principles to be in accordance with the MDRS: GRZ-P16 Supported Living and Older Persons Accommodation The development of supported living accommodation will be provided for in a range of forms, including units, minor residential units, complexes, shared accommodation, rest homes and retirement <b>villages accommodation</b> , where it is located within the Residential Zones <b>and integrated with the surrounding environment to meet the particular needs and characteristics of older persons</b> . Supported living accommodation includes accommodation <b>that is suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons, specifically designed for older persons</b> .  Supported living accommodation will be undertaken in accordance with the following principles: 1. ... 2. ... 3. the scale and design of development will <b>reflect be consistent with the residential nature and character of the location, recognising that the residential nature and character will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities, and ensure access through the subject site by the public and residents, including the provision of public legal roads and pedestrian accessways consistent with residential scale blocks; and</b> 4. ... 5. <b>the development will recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</b> <b>a. may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services; and</b> <b>b. have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</b>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.  With respect to requested amendments to sub-policy (3), I consider that referring to 'planned' residential nature and character is more efficient that adding 'recognising that the residential nature and character will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities'. I also disagree with the removal of the second part of sub-policy (3) as I consider that this exists for a specific purpose and is not contrary to the MDRS or NPS-UD).	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the S42A report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-P16. Refer section 4.37 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the S42A report.
S197	S197.39	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General Residential Zone - Policies	Not specified	The RVA considers that it is appropriate for the District Plan to recognise the intensification opportunities of larger sites for the reasons set out in the submission.	<b>Add</b> a new policy as follows: <b>Larger sites.</b> <b>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that "larger sites" are likely to be able to be more efficiently planned and developed because of their size, which would enable more efficient arrangement of residential units, efficient layout of access and other development infrastructure, and a lower proportion of site area located adjacent to existing boundaries. I therefore do not consider that it is necessary to include a District Plan policy to provide for the more efficient use of larger sites, because I consider that they can be more efficiently used in any case.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.40	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General Residential Zone - Policies	Not specified	The RVA considers that it is appropriate for the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	<b>Add</b> a new policy to the General Residential Zone that enables the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments. <b>GRZ-PX Role of density standards.</b> <b>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I disagree that a policy needs to be provided to enable the density standards to be utilised as a "baseline". The MDRS density standards are incorporated into the permitted activity rule for buildings and structures in the General Residential Zone (GRZ-Rx1), and as such, the permitted baseline approach for the assessment of effects provided for by sections 95E(2)(a) and 104(2) of the RMA is already enabled.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.41	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	General Residential Zone - Policies	Not specified	In addition to the current general policies for all residential zones, as noted in the submission above, the RVA considers that 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.	<b>Add</b> a new policy to the General Residential Zone chapter that recognises the diverse and changing community needs and that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time. <b>RESZ-PX Changing communities.</b> <b>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.</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The requested policy covers two key matters: 1. Providing for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities by recognising that existing character and amenity will change over time; 2. Enabling a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.  I consider that each of these matters are already provided for through a range of objectives and policies that are part of PC2, including: 1. DO-O11, DO-Ox2, DO-Ox3, UFD-Px, UFD-P2, UFD-P3, UFD-P4, UFD-P11, GRZ-Px4 and GRZ-P10 all provide, in some form, for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities by recognising that existing character and amenity will change over time; and 2. DO-O3(7), DO-Ox2, DO-Ox3, UFD-P1(3)(a), UFD-P2, GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px6, and GRZ-P9 all enable, in some form, a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.  On the basis that I consider these matters are already addressed, I do not consider the new policy to be necessary.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.42	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-R4	Oppose	The RVA considers retirement villages as a use/activity should be provided for as a permitted activity in residential zones. The standards limiting this permitted activity rule to 6 residents / one residential unit in this rule are inappropriate.	The RVA <b>seeks</b> a permitted activity rule for retirement villages that is not subject to any standards.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S197.42.FS01	Waka Kotahi	GRZ-R4	Oppose primary submission	<i>Retirement villages have effects to the wider environment that need to be considered – such as effects to the transport network from traffic generation. The plan as proposed provides for retirement activities as a permitted activity – to a limited scale.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission point.</i>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.43	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx1	Support in part	<p>The RVA supports GRZ-Rx1 and associated standards in principle, as they align with the density standards of the MDRS.</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the following amendments should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of residential units per site – with the addition of the definition proposed by the RVA above, this standard should be amended to refer to 'retirement units';</li> <li>- Height in relation to boundary - additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones;</li> <li>- Outdoor living space - as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard;</li> <li>- Outlook space – in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents) the outlook space standard is not directly relevant. Amendments should be made to the standard to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages;</li> <li>- Windows to street - the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units; and</li> <li>- Landscaped area - the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units also.</li> </ul> <p>However, retirement villages will likely infringe the number of residential units per site standard (GRZRx1), so the construction of retirement villages will be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. The RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). This relief is addressed in response to GRZ-Rx5 further below.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> the GRZ-Rx1 standards as follows:</p> <p><b>Standards</b></p> <p><b>Number of residential units or retirement units per site</b></p> <p><b>1. There must be no more than 3 residential units or retirement units per site.</b></p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Height in relation to boundary</b></p> <p><b>3. ...</b></p> <p><b>This standard does not apply to:</b></p> <p>...</p> <p><b>d. Boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, rural zones, commercial and mixed use zones, industrial zones and special purpose zones.</b></p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Outdoor living space (per unit)</b></p> <p>...</p> <p><b>8. For retirement units, clauses 6 and 7 apply with the following modifications:</b></p> <p><b>(a) The outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</b></p> <p><b>(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.</b></p> <p><b>Outlook space (per unit)</b></p> <p><b>8-9.</b></p> <p><b>1. ...</b></p> <p><b>1. For retirement units, clause 9(a) – (f) apply with the following modifications: 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.</b></p> <p><b>Windows to Street</b></p> <p><b>9-10. A residential unit or retirement unit facing the a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors.</b></p> <p><b>Landscaped area</b></p> <p><b>10-11. A residential unit or retirement unit at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of s developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees, regardless of the ground treatment below them.</b></p> <p><b>11-12. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit.</b></p>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.44	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose in part	<p>The RVA supports in principle the provision for greater height in the Residential Intensification Precinct. However, it considers a High Density Residential Zone should be provided in the District Plan with more lenient density standards.</p>	<p>The RVA <b>seeks</b> the application of High Density Residential zoning to the Residential Intensification Precinct and more lenient density standards compared to the MDRS.</p>	4.4.4 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Kāinga Ora requests	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.45	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-Rx5 – GRZ-Rx7	Support in part	<p>The RVA supports the provision for new buildings and structures, and additions or alterations to buildings and structures as a restricted discretionary activity under Rules GRZ-Rx5 – GRZ Rx7 when not complying with one or more standards.</p> <p>However, the RVA considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>As detailed further in response to GRZ-R19, the RVA considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity, and that it should instead only be the retirement village building(s) that is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>When considering the matters of discretion that are currently applicable to retirement villages under GRZ-Rx5 – GRZ-Rx7, those matters include matters contained in the Residential Design Guide that make no specific reference to retirement villages, with 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).</p> <p>The RVA considers 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>The RVA considers that internal amenity standards applicable to retirement villages should be limited to those controls / standards necessary or appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>The RVA supports GRZ-Rx5 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act consider that a retirement village that is compliant with the relevant standards should also be precluded from limited notification.</p>	<p><b>Amended</b> GRZ-Rx5 to GRZ-Rx7 to exclude retirement villages and instead a bespoke rule for the construction / establishment of retirement village buildings is included in the District Plan with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages. This regime will provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p><b>GRZ-RX Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village</b></p> <p><b>Notification</b></p> <p><b>Public notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule is precluded. Limited notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule that complies with standards GRZ-Rx1.2 – GRZ-Rx1.5 is precluded.</b></p> <p><b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b></p> <p><b>Matters of Discretion</b></p> <p><b>1. The effects resulting from the exceedance of any infringed GRZ-Rx1 Standards;</b></p> <p><b>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</b></p> <p><b>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</b></p> <p><b>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</b></p> <p><b>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider:</b></p> <p><b>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</b></p> <p><b>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</b></p> <p><b>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</b></p> <p><b>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</b></p>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.46	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	GRZ-R19	Oppose	<p>As set out above, the RVA considers that retirement villages as a land use activity should be classified as a permitted activity under its own rule – with the construction / establishment of retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity.</p>	<p><b>Exclude</b> retirement villages from GRZ-R19, with its provision as a land use activity provided for under the new rule proposed in response to GRZ-R4 above.</p>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.47	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-P3	Support in part	<p>The RVA supports the recognition that local and onsite amenity values will develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations in line with the NPSUD. It seeks the deletion of the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced" as it is inconsistent with that recognition.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> LCZ-P3 to delete the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced".</p>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The policy direction that regard is given to maintaining and enhancing local and on-site amenity values is qualified by "where practicable, while recognising that these values develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations". I consider that this is consistent with Objective 4 of the NPS-UD.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.48	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-P5, Design Guides	Oppose in part	<p>The RVA supports LCZ-P5 and its provision for mixed use development, including residential activities, which enhance the viability and vitality of the Centre.</p> <p>The RVA opposes the requirement for the amenity to be in accordance with the Centres Design Guide. The Guide should not be applicable to retirement villages, noting that the design guide has been developed for standard residential developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.</p> <p>Further, the RVA considers the restriction on development requiring a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors to be achieved before the development is enabled is contrary to the MDRS direction to "encourage" high quality development.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> LCZ-P5 as follows:</p> <p><b>Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is encouraged, achieved in accordance with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</b></p>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.49	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-P6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the requirement to apply the Centres Design Guide. As set out above, the Centres 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).  The RVA also seeks amendments for consistency with Policy 3 NPSUD.	<b>Exclude</b> references to the Centres Design Guide in relation to retirement villages. <b>Replace</b> "up to" with "at least".	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the second request to replace "up to" with "at least", I consider that because PC2 amends the District Plan to enable development up to (and including) the heights specified in Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, this achieves the requirement in Policy 3 that the District Plan provide for "at least" those same heights.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.50	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Local Centre Zone – Policies	Not specified	The RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Local Centre Zone is required as set out in the submission above.	<b>Add</b> the following policies to the Local Centre Zone: <u>LCZ-PX Provisions of housing for an ageing population</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 the Local Centre Zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.  <u>LCZ-PX Larger sites</u> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Local Centre Zone by provided for more efficient use of those sites.  <u>LCZ-PX Changing communities</u> To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Local Centre Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.51	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	LCZ-R6, LCZ-R12	Support in part	The RVA supports LCZ-R6 in principle, and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant standards (with infringement of any standards resulting in a restricted discretionary activity status under Rule LCZ-R12 or a discretionary activity status under Rule LCZ-R16). The RVA considers amendments to the standards are however required, in line with the submission on GRZ-Rx1 above.  The RVA considers however that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, 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 RVA opposes the application of the Centres Design Guide as a matter of discretion.  The RVA considers 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.	<b>Amend</b> LCZ-R6 to align the standards with the relief sought on GRZ-Rx1 above (S197.43).  <b>Add</b> a new rule for the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or structure of a retirement village is included in the District Plan as follows, with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages:  <u>LCZ-RX Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village.</u>  <u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u>  <u>Notification</u> Public notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule is precluded. Limited notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule that complies with standards LCZ-R6.1 – LCZ-R6.3 is precluded.  <u>Matters of Discretion</u> 1. The effects of any non-compliance with any infringed LCZ-R6 Standards; 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; 5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.52	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Local Centre Zone – Rules	Not specified	The RVA considers that 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). A permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages provide substantial benefit 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. Such a rule will be consistent with the broader permitted rule for residential activities – TCZ-P5.	<b>Add</b> a new rule to the Local Centre Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities: <u>LCZ-RX Retirement village.</u> <u>Permitted Activity.</u> <u>Standards</u> N/A	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.53	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MUZ-P4	Support in part	The RVA supports the recognition that local and onsite amenity values will develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations in line with the NPSUD. It seeks the deletion of the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced" as it is inconsistent with that recognition.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-P4 to delete the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to my assessment under submission point S194.47.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.54	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MUZ-P6	Oppose in part	The RVA supports MUZ-P6 and its provision for mixed use development, including residential activities, which enhance the viability and vitality of the Centre.  The RVA opposes the requirement for the amenity to be in accordance with the Centres Design Guide. The Guide should not be applicable to retirement villages, noting that the design guide has been developed for standard residential developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.  Further, the RVA considers the restriction on development requiring a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors to be achieved before the development is enabled is contrary to the MDRS direction to "encourage" high quality development.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-P6 as follows: Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is encouraged, achieved in accordance with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.55	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MUZ-P7	Oppose in part	The RVA consider however that the application of the Centres Design Guide to achieve this should not be applicable to retirement villages, noting that the design guide has been developed for standard residential developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.  The RVA also seeks amendments for consistency with Policy 3 NPSUD.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-P7 to remove reference to the Centres Design Guide. <b>Replace</b> "up to" with "at least".	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the second request to replace "up to" with "at least", I consider that because PC2 amends the District Plan to enable development up to (and including) the heights specified in Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, this achieves the requirement in Policy 3 that the District Plan provide for "at least" those same heights.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.56	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Mixed Use Zone - Policies	Not specified	The RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Mixed Use Zone is required as set out in the submission above.	<b>Add</b> the following policies to the Mixed Use Zone: <b>MUZ-PX Provisions of housing for an ageing population.</b> <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 the Mixed Use Zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>  <b>MUZ-PX Larger sites</b> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Mixed Use Zone by provided for more efficient use of those sites.</u>  <b>MUZ-PX Changing communities</b> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Mixed Use Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.57	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MUZ-R6	Support in part	The RVA supports MUZ-R6 in principle, and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant standards (with infringement of any standards resulting in a restricted discretionary activity status under Rule MUZ-R13 or a discretionary activity status under Rule MUZ-R14). The RVA considers amendments to the standards are however required, in line with the submission on GRZ-Rx1 above.  The RVA considers however that the construction of a retirement villages should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, 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 RVA opposes the application of the Centres Design Guide as a matter of discretion.  The RVA considers 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.	<b>Amend</b> MUZ-R6 to align the standards with the relief sought on GRZ-Rx1 above (S197.43).  <b>Add</b> a new rule for the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or structure of a retirement village is included in the District Plan as follows, with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages. This relief will provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities: <b>MUZ-RX Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village.</b>  <b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b>  <b>Notification</b> <u>Public notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule is precluded.</u> <u>Limited notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule that complies with standards MUZ-R6.1 and MUZ-R6.2 is precluded.</u>  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> <u>1. The effects of any non-compliance with any infringed MUZ-R6 Standards;</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement 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>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.58	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Mixed Use Zone - Rules	Not specified	The RVA considers that 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 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. Such a rule will be consistent with the broader permitted rule for residential activities – MCZ-P5.	<b>Add</b> a new rule is to the Mixed Use Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities: <b>MUZ-RX Retirement village</b> <b>Permitted Activity</b> <b>Standards</b> <b>N/A</b>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.59	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-P3	Support in part	The RVA supports the recognition that local and onsite amenity values will develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations in line with the NPSUD. It seeks the deletion of the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced" as it is inconsistent with that recognition.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-P3 to delete the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to my assessment under submission point S194.47.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.60	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-P5	Oppose in part	The RVA supports TCZ-P5 and its provision for mixed use development, including residential activities, which enhance the viability and vitality of the Centre.  The RVA opposes the requirement for the amenity to be in accordance with the Centres Design Guide should not be applicable to retirement villages, noting that the design guide has been developed for standard residential developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.  Further, the RVA considers the restriction on development requiring a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors to be achieved before the development is enabled is contrary to the MDRS direction to "encourage" high quality development.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-P5 as follows: <u>Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is encouraged, achieved in accordance with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.</u>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.61	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-P6	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the requirement to apply the Centres Design Guide. As set out above, the Centres 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).  The RVA also seeks amendments for consistency with Policy 3 NPSUD.	<b>Exclude</b> references to the Centres Design Guide in relation to retirement villages. <b>Replace</b> "up to" with "at least".	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the second request to replace "up to" with "at least", I consider that because PC2 amends the District Plan to enable development up to (and including) the heights specified in Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, this achieves the requirement in Policy 3 that the District Plan provide for "at least" those same heights.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.62	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Town Centre Zone – Policies	Not specified	The RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Town Centre Zone is required as set out in the submission above.	Add the following policies to the Town Centre Zone chapter: <b>TCZ-PX Provisions of housing for an ageing population</b> 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the Town Centre Zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.  <b>TCZ-PX Larger sites</b> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Town Centre Zone by provided for more efficient use of those sites.  <b>TCZ-PX Changing communities</b> To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Town Centre Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.63	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TCZ-R6, TCZ-R7, TCZ-R11, TCZ-R14	Support in part	The RVA supports TCZ-R6 and R7 in principle, and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant standards (with infringement of any standards resulting in a restricted discretionary activity status under Rule TCZ-R11 or a discretionary activity status under Rule TCZ-R14). The RVA considers amendments to the standards are however required, in line with the submission on GRZ-Rx1 above.  The RVA considers however that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, 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 RVA opposes the application of the Centres Design Guide as a matter of discretion.  The RVA considers 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.	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-R6 to align the standards with the relief sought on GRZ-Rx1 above (S197.43).  <b>Add</b> a new rule for the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or structure of a retirement village is included in the District Plan as follows, with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages: <b>TCZ-RX Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village</b> <b>Restricted Discretionary Activity</b>  <b>Notification</b> Public notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule is precluded. Limited notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule that complies with standards TCZ-R6.1 - TCZ-R6.3 is precluded.  <b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed TCZ-R6 Standards; 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; 5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.64	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Town Centre Zone - Rules	Not specified	The RVA considers the Town 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 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. Such a rule will be consistent with the broader permitted rule for residential activities – LCZ-P5.	<b>Add</b> a new rule to the Mixed Use Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities: <b>TCZ-RX Retirement village</b> <b>Permitted Activity</b> <b>Standards</b> N/A	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.65	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-P5	Support in part	The RVA supports the recognition that local and onsite amenity values will develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities and future generations in line with the NPSUD. It seeks the deletion of the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced" as it is inconsistent with that recognition.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-P5 to delete the direction for amenity values to be "maintained and enhanced".	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Refer to my assessment under submission point S194.47.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.66	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-P7	Oppose in part	The RVA supports MCZ-P7 and its provision for mixed use development, including residential activities, which enhance the viability and vitality of the Centre.  The RVA opposes the requirement for the amenity to be in accordance with the Centres Design Guide should not be applicable to retirement villages, noting that the design guide has been developed for standard residential developments and is not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.  Further, the RVA considers the restriction on development requiring a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors to be achieved before the development is enabled is contrary to the MDRS direction to "encourage" high quality development.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-P7 as follows: Mixed use development, including residential activities, will be enabled in centres to enhance the viability and vitality of the centre where a high level of amenity for residents, businesses and visitors is encouraged, achieved in accordance with the Centres Design Guide in Appendix x2.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.67	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-P8	Oppose in part	The RVA opposes the requirement to apply the Centres Design Guide. As set out above, the Centres 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).  The RVA also seeks amendments for consistency with Policy 3 NPSUD.	<b>Exclude</b> references to the Centres Design Guide in relation to retirement villages. <b>Replace</b> "up to" with "at least".	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the second request to replace "up to" with "at least", I consider that because PC2 amends the District Plan to enable development up to (and including) the heights specified in Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, this achieves the requirement in Policy 3 that the District Plan provide for "at least" those same heights.	Do not accept.	No.
S197	S197.68	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Metropolitan Centre Zone – Policies	Not specified	The RVA considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required as set out in the submission above.	Add the following policies to the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter: <b>MCZ-PX Provisions of housing for an ageing population</b> 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.  <b>MCZ-PX Larger sites</b> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Metropolitan Centre Zone by provided for more efficient use of those sites.  <b>MCZ-PX Changing communities</b> To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the Metropolitan Centre Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197	S197.69	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	MCZ-R7, MCZ-R11, MCZ-R13, MCZ-R17	Support in part	<p>The RVA supports MCZ-R7 in principle, and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant standards (with infringement of any standards resulting in a controlled activity status under MCZ-R11, a restricted discretionary activity status under Rule MCZ-R13 or a discretionary activity status under Rule MCZ-R17). The RVA considers amendments to the standards are however required, in line with the submission on GRZ-Rx1 above.</p> <p>The RVA considers however that the construction of a retirement villages should be a restricted discretionary activity under a specific retirement village rule, 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).</p> <p>The RVA opposes the application of the Centres Design Guide as a matter of discretion.</p> <p>The RVA considers 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><b>Amend</b> MCZ-R7 to align the standards with the relief sought on GRZ-Rx1 above (S197.43).</p> <p><b>Add</b> a new rule for the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or structure of a retirement village is included in the District Plan as follows, with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages. This relief is to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities: <u>MCZ-RX Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village</u> <u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u></p> <p><u>Notification</u> <u>Public notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule is precluded.</u> <u>Limited notification of an application for resource consent under this Rule that complies with standards MCZ-R7.1 and MCZ-R7.2 is precluded.</u></p> <p><b>Matters of Discretion</b> 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed MCZ-R7 Standards; 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; 5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 3, consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village; 6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. <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>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197	S197.70	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Metropolitan Centre Zone - Rules	Not specified	The RVA considers that 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), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit 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. Such a rule will be consistent with the broader permitted rule for residential activities – MCZ-R3.	<p><b>Add</b> a new rule to the Metropolitan Centre Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities. <u>MCZ-RX Retirement village</u> <u>Permitted Activity</u> <u>Standards</u> <u>N/A</u></p>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S197.70.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Metropolitan Centre Zone - Rules	Oppose primary submission	<i>Retirement villages have effects to the wider environment that need to be considered – such as effects to the transport network from traffic generation.</i>	<i>Disallow primary submission point.</i>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S207.FS.1	S197.FS01	Metifecare Limited	Full submission	Support primary submission	<p><i>The amendments sought by the RVA ensure that the Plan Change:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>- will give effect to the objectives and policies of the NPS UD;</i></li> <li><i>- will contribute to well-functioning urban environments;</i></li> <li><i>- are consistent with the sustainable management of physical resources and the purpose and principles and the RMA;</i></li> <li><i>- ensure that the Plan Change is clear;</i></li> <li><i>- recognises the crucial role that retirement and aged care facilities have in providing for the health and wellbeing of the New Zealand community and the provision of housing for elderly residents;</i></li> <li><i>- will meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the RMA;</i></li> <li><i>- recognises and provides for the differing functional and operational needs of retirements villages;</i></li> <li><i>- will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and</i></li> <li><i>- are consistent with sound resource management practice.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Metifecare also seeks such other additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.</i></p>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S100.FS.1	S197.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Full submission	Support primary submission	<p><i>Ātiawa supports the provision of housing and care facilities within retirement villages. We recognise the unique nature of those facilities and the role they play in communities. We also recognise that they form part of the community and, as with other activities they have effects that need to be assessed and avoided, remedies or mitigated.</i></p> <p><i>Ātiawa therefore oppose the proposal to exempt retirement villages from design criteria, enable increased densities and preclude notification</i></p> <p><i>Recognise, within PC2, the role of retirement villages within our communities and provide design criteria or require structure plans relevant to the activity.</i></p>	<i>Allow primary submission in part.</i>	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S198	S198.01	Ridley, Helen	GRZ-Px6	Not specified	<p>While the plan acknowledges Ōtaki as a special area 'unique for its tangata whenua presence', the plan change fails to recognise the fundamental significance of the Māori presence in the town (with its educational establishments, burgeoning and normalisation to Te Reo, Māori business, creativity, arts, marae, historical areas etc) as Ōtaki's special and differentiating characteristics.</p> <p>Changes to building heights in the area around the Old Town, reaching right along the 'sea to mountain' pathway, and including historical whanau residential areas need to be considered carefully in terms of likely negative impacts on Ōtaki's 'difference' and is also likely to affect both economic and social change to disadvantage those other than developers and the business sector.</p> <p>The current height restrictions should remain 'frozen' until there is more discussion (led by local hapū and others involved in social effects of housing intensification) before changes are made.</p>	<b>Delete</b> the application of policy GRZ-Px6 regarding Residential Intensification Precincts in Ōtaki township (not around SH1 and the Railway). I.e. retain 3 and 2 storey residential height levels in Precinct A and Precinct B, until there has been further consideration with Ōtaki hapū.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that it would be inconsistent with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD to remove Residential Intensification Precinct B from the area around the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone. I also consider that it would be inconsistent with the requirement to incorporate the MDRS into the General Residential Zone to retain the existing 2-storey building heights provided for by the operative District Plan in the area around the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S198.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-Px6	Support primary submission	<p><i>Support this submission. Tangata whenua are already a group who are badly represented in housing, health and mental health statistics. Not recognizing their cultural and mental health needs by cramming them into crowded urbanized environments is highly unlikely to improve their mental health outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>Many people (including tangata whenua) need to rest their eyes on much greenery in hills, nearby foliage and trees, or over water, to restore spiritual and mental equilibrium. These are cultural values as well as spiritual and health values.</i></p>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S249.FS.1	S198.01.FS02	Francis, Elizabeth	GRZ-Px6	Support primary submission	<p><i>Support this submission. Ōtaki has a unique identity both historically and culturally. Any development must ensure its unique character is not just retained, but enhanced. To ignore Ōtaki's place as a centre of significant Māori settlement, education, culture, and business in favour of commercial only interests would be tantamount to a replay of early colonial practice.</i></p>	<i>Allow primary submission.</i>	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	<i>Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>	<i>Refer to primary submission above.</i>
S198	S198.02	Ridley, Helen	PRECx6 - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Not specified	See submission point S198.01.	<b>Extend</b> the Marae Takiwā precinct to Dunstan Street along Mill Road, and nearby residential streets.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	The Marae Takiwā Precinct manages the adverse effects that may result from increased heights and densities of development on sites adjacent to marae. I therefore do not consider there to be a sufficient basis to extend the precinct to Dunstan Street, as this is a considerable distance from the Raukawa Marae.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S199	S199.01	Godwin, Laurian	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S199.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged landward of the eastern boundary. We agree that Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting that in our iwi perspective the coastline should all be consider 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. We agree the most of our residents would consider allowing higher development along the Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zones those areas will potentially be affected by coastal hazards (such as sea level rise, erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc) within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We support the reference that it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. The Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S199	S199.02	Godwin, Laurian	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S199.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S199	S199.03	Godwin, Laurian	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S199.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S199	S199.04	Godwin, Laurian	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S200	S200.01	George, Christopher	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S200.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Support that our Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting that in our iwi perspective the entire coastline be considered 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. We agree the most of our Kāpiti residents would consider allowing higher development along the coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones are areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards and climate change impacts within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy (e.g. NZCPS Policies 6, 7, 14 and RMA Part 2) and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We support the reference that it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. We agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged landward of the eastern boundary. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S200	S200.02	George, Christopher	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S200.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S200	S200.03	George, Christopher	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S200.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S200	S200.04	George, Christopher	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S201	S201.01	George, Andrew	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Use of the Jacobs Report to identify a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not supported for various reasons. - The proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not give effect to/is contrary to policies 3, 4 and 25 of the NZCPS and policies 8 and 6(e) of the NPS-UD. - PC2 is contrary to policy 25 of the NZCPS, because it permits redevelopment in areas subject to coastal inundation, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise. - The approach of relying on existing flood hazard provisions is problematic for a range of reasons, including that exposure to economic harm and loss, and exposure of infrastructure and public assets, is not eliminated through compliance with flood hazard provisions. - The landward boundary of the Coastal Environment area identified in the District Plan (or alternatively the landward boundary of the Adaptation Zones published by the Council) is the best currently available delineation in the District Plan of the "area potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years." - PC2 fails to recognise section 6(a) of the RMA. - The natural character of the coastal environment is a significant component of what makes Kapiti coast distinctive and valued. The coastal environment itself is a significant asset for the Council and local communities. - Most residents would consider allowing higher development along the urbanised Kapiti coast to be inappropriate, and it would be inconsistent with non-statutory Council documents and previous Council decisions. - Policies 6, 7 & 14 of the NZCPS are given effect to in the District Plan through provisions for areas of outstanding or high natural character, and the Beach Residential Precincts. - The impact of building height on Beach Residential Precincts will be significant and their loss would be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. - Council is required to preserve remaining natural character, noting almost all of the Paraparaumu and Waikanae coastline is identified by Council as "high natural character". - Existing controls provide protection from inappropriate development should remain in and adjacent to all areas of "high natural character" - The outcomes from PC2 will be larger single homes, not the additional household units as intended by the NPS-UD or the RMA. - The decisions requested are considered to be consistent with Council's ability to exclude areas to which the MDRS apply under the RMA. - Other councils (Auckland) have considered a qualifying matter based on character. - It is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character, and to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct so that it has a landward (eastern) boundary that matches the landward boundary of either: a. the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan; or b. the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones which the Kapiti Coast District Council determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ).  Pending a plan change promulgated by the Council relating to Coastal Hazards. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters A and B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S201.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	<i>Agree the most of our Kāpiti residents would consider allowing higher development along the coast to be inappropriate. We support that Council must make decisions to preserve remaining natural character. Noting that in our iwi perspective the entire coastline be considered 'high natural character' as well as of 'high cultural value'. We agree with reference to the Takutai Kāpiti Adaptation Zones as areas that will potentially be affected by coastal hazards and climate change impacts within the next 100 years (e.g. sea level rise, coastal erosion, severe storm surges, groundwater saturation, flooding etc). Limiting intensification in these coastal regions is aligned with current Government Policy requirements and wise future decision making based on current known predictions. We support the reference that it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of natural hazards and natural character to make an overall assessment on the requirement for a qualifying matter. Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged landward of the eastern boundary. We recommend that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts in the District Plan.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S201	S201.02	George, Andrew	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S200.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct, and that all existing District Plan provisions continue to apply to Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts, and Residential Intensification Precinct B is removed from all Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S201	S201.03	George, Andrew	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	See submission point S201.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> PC2 to adopt a larger Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct based on a full landscape assessment of the coastal environment, particularly as it relates to Waikanae Beach. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter G in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S201	S201.04	George, Andrew	Local Centre Zone	Oppose	The submission states that it is appropriate to consider the merits of existing Local Centre Zones as they are impacted by any further enlarger Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. The submitter considers that the Council has treated Local Centres inconsistently and there is no assessment of the need for a Local Centre at Te Moana.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Local Centre Zone to give effect to an enlarged Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct or a Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter H in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202	S202.01	Leith Consulting Ltd	Planning Maps	Support in part	This will improve plan useability as it is not obvious at first using the planning maps that the 'existing qualifying matter areas' such as 'ponding' apply and are considered 'qualifying matters'.	For ease of plan interpretation, please clearly <b>specify</b> via a layer in the planning maps all the qualifying matter areas in one layer that apply to the residential areas. Having existing and new qualifying matters can be confusing for plan users. Having the qualifying matters listed in one area on the planning maps makes this much more user friendly.  Also support any other <b>consequential changes</b> required to improve plan useability and to make it much clearer regarding the implications of the 'qualifying matter areas'.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	I do not consider it appropriate to specify all qualifying matters in a single District Plan map layer, as each qualifying matter addresses a unique resource management issue.  However, I note that the definition of "qualifying matter area" outlined under section 20.11 of PC(N) (which I have recommended be amended to "identified qualifying matter" under section 20.11 of PC(R1)) includes a list of all qualifying matters contained in the District Plan, and I consider that this addresses the matters raised by the submitter.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202	S202.02	Leith Consulting Ltd	General	Not specified	The corresponding Section 32 reports confirm that the MDRS apply to General Residential sites, including those subject to a qualifying matter (such as ponding) but explain that development may be constrained by needing to achieve compliance with rules/standards relating to that qualifying matter (e.g. in the case of ponding - achieving minimum building floor levels). This intent is not however clear within the Plan itself.  To avoid confusion, ambiguity, and interpretation issues it is important that the Plan can stand on its own, without being read in conjunction with its s32 reports.	For ease of plan interpretation, please <b>amend</b> the rules to clearly specify that the MDRS apply to all General Residential Zoned sites, including those subject to a qualifying matter.  Also support any other <b>consequential changes</b> required to improve plan readability and to make the applicability of 'qualifying matters' clearer.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Rules GRZ-Rx1 and GRZ-Rx2 are the principle land use rules that provide for the MDRS as a permitted activity in the General Residential Zone. These rules apply throughout the General Residential Zone, except within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and the Marae Takiwā precinct, and these exceptions are stated in the rule.  In relation to qualifying matters that exist as overlays in the District Plan, the rules associated with these overlays apply in the ordinary way. That is, where there is an overlay in a specific area, the rules associated with the overlay apply to that area in addition to the General Residential Zone rules. I do not consider any further specification or explanation in the Plan is necessary to clarify this.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.9	S202.02.FS01	Landlink	General	Support primary submission	As per Landlink's primary submission - further clarity is required around flood risk and MDRH.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.3 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Other Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S202	S202.03	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-P14	Support in part	Amending this policy as requested will improve plan useability and will reduce confusion and plan interpretation issues when considering 'minor residential units' within the Residential Zone.  For example, there was potential confusion over whether the MDRS rules (such as minimum criteria for glazing) apply to 'minor residential units' and whether the GRZ-Rx1-1 applies to 'minor residential units' per site.  We assume that 'residential unit' in this context includes 'minor residential units' so that you cannot have '3 residential units and 3 minor residential units' per site.	Please amend this policy to reflect that Minor Residential Units are only specifically provided for in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct under GRZ-R6. GRZ-Rx1 doesn't appear to provide for minor residential units specifically anymore as the MDRS provisions have been adopted and do not differentiate between 'minor residential units' and 'residential units'.  We also support any consequential changes to the plan as a result of our relief sought. For example, notes could be added to the start of the Residential Zone chapter that make it clear that minor residential units only apply to the Coastal Qualify Matter Precinct.  Alternatively, GRZ-Rx1 could be amended to clarify via a note or change to the wording (if there is scope to do so) that the standard also applies to 'minor residential units'.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	The rule that incorporates the MDRS does not distinguish between residential units and minor residential units. I consider that this means that minor residential units are residential units, and that therefore that the standards under rule GRZ-Rx1 apply to all residential units (including units determined to be minor residential units).  However, I consider that the matters outlined under policy GRZ-P14 are only relevant to the construction of minor residential units as a permitted activity under rule GRZ-R6 in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (or as a discretionary activity under rule GRZ-R18). I therefore consider it appropriate to amend policy GRZ-P14 to reflect this.	<b>Accept.</b> Amend GRZ-P16.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-P16. Refer section 4.38 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for clearer interpretation of policy GRZ-P14 (which is only relevant in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct). It also avoids the risk that this policy may be read in conflict with policies related to the application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD outside of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.
S202	S202.04	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose in part	The Council should be encouraging subdivision of land into smaller allotments as controlled activities or restricted discretionary activities where it can be shown via building plans submitted at the time of subdivision that the site and subdivision can comply with the MDRS provisions. That way, building and subdivision can be applied for, processed and approved, to be completed concurrently. This represents an efficient use of resources for all parties.	<b>Amend</b> column two, row one of SUB-RES-Table x1 as follows:  <u>An allotment that contains a residential unit or has an approved land use resource consent for a residential unit or it can be demonstrated that is practicable to construct residential units within the allotments that comply with Rules GRZ-Rx1, GRx2 or GRZ-Rx3.</u>  To give effect to the above relief, <b>consequential amendments</b> to other parts of the plan should be enabled. For example, the matters of discretion should be modified under SUB-RES-R27 to give effect to the requested relief.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider that the amendment requested is necessary in order to comply with the requirements of clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the RMA (which relate to prohibitions on minimum allotment size and shape factors in District Plans).  I do not consider that any other consequential amendments are required in order to give effect to the amendment requested.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-Table x1. Refer to section 10.13 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it ensures that the requirements in SUB-RES-Table x1 comply with the requirements in clause 8 of Schedule 3A to the RMA.
S160.FS.2	S202.04.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose primary submission	The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kāpiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.  The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.9	S202.04.FS02	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Support primary submission	KCDC should support subdivision of land into smaller vacant allotments - without requiring detailed land use plans. This is because the potential uptake of MDRH will be broadened if people are able to create smaller vacant allotments. Providing land use plans for developments which may not be realised is not an efficient use of resources. Additionally, a non-complying status for subdivision for vacant lots not meeting a 450m2/15m diameter requirement is viewed as overly restrictive given the permitted baseline provided by MDRS. Suggest a new minimum lot size is determined through analysis of size of lots that MDRH can be reasonably facilitated on - retention of 450m2 reflects older provisions of the District Plan which did not account for MDRH. Acknowledgement that this is a complex area and work may be constrained given short timeframes but a well-considered new minimum lot size (if retention of a minimum lot size is considered appropriate) will likely lead to better urban design outcomes.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.05	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose	If an applicant does not wish to, or is unable to, submit detailed building plans that show compliance with the MDRS provisions at the time of applying for subdivision consent then they should be able to create vacant allotments of at least 300m2 in area with a shape factor of 14m diameter circle, as this allotment size better reflects the increased development density the Kāpiti Coast will be needing and is more enabling of infill developments based on common underlying allotment sizes. This will also enable the Plan provisions to align with neighbouring councils.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-RES-Table x1 column three, row two as follows: <u>450m<sup>2</sup> (inclusive of access) 300m<sup>2</sup></u>  <b>Amend</b> column five, row two as follows: <u>Must be capable of accommodating an 18 14 metre diameter circle.</u>  <u>Where a rear allotment is created, the shape factor circle for the front allotment(s) may extend over the access leg for the rear allotment by up to 3 metres.</u>	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	While I consider that the minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor could be reduced to be more consistent with the MDRS, I am mindful that a vacant allotment, once subdivided, will enable the construction of 3 dwellings on that single vacant allotment as a permitted activity (not one). I is not clear to me from the information contained in the submission that a 300m2 minimum allotment area is sufficient to accommodate 3 residential units.  I note that the Ministry for the Environment's Medium Density Residential Standards factsheet (see <a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf</a> ) illustrate three potential MDRS development outcomes each based on an approximate 420m2 site area and a minimum site width of 13 metres. On this basis, I consider it appropriate to reduce the minimum vacant allotment size to 420m2 and shape factor to 13 metres.  In any case, I note that: - There is no minimum allotment size or shape factor for allotments that have an approved land use consent (and this would include where land use consent is bundled with the subdivision consent). - In response to submission point S202.04, I have recommended that there be no minimum allotment size or shape factor where it can be demonstrated that it is practicable to construct residential units on the allotment that comply with rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 and GRZ-Rx3.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend the minimum vacant allotment area to 420m2 and the minimum vacant allotment shape factor to 13 metres.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-Table x1. Refer to section 10.13 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor that is more consistent with the level of development anticipated by the MDRS.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S160.FS.2	S202.05.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose primary submission	The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kāpiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.  The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.9	S202.05.FS02	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Support primary submission	KCDC should support subdivision of land into smaller vacant allotments - without requiring detailed land use plans. This is because the potential uptake of MDRH will be broadened if people are able to create smaller vacant allotments. Providing land use plans for developments which may not be realised is not an efficient use of resources. Additionally, a non-complying status for subdivision for vacant lots not meeting a 450m2/15m diameter requirement is viewed as overly restrictive given the permitted baseline provided by MDRS. Suggest a new minimum lot size is determined through analysis of size of lots that MDRH can be reasonably facilitated on - retention of 450m2 reflects older provisions of the District Plan which did not account for MDRH. Acknowledgement that this is a complex area and work may be constrained given short timeframes but a well-considered new minimum lot size (if retention of a minimum lot size is considered appropriate) will likely lead to better urban design outcomes.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.06	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-RES-R27	Support in part	The amended wording provides more certainty to the information requirements and meaning beyond the intent of these standards. As written, there may be debates as to what is considered 'practicable' and what level of detail is required at the time of making an application. Furthermore, the term "land use consent" could mean anything e.g. an earthworks consent, and should be reworded to improve clarity of the meaning.  The bulk and location effects of the residential buildings should be considered under the General Residential Zone provisions and an applicant should not be penalized for applying for a joint land use consent and subdivision for a breach of the MDRS rules - which would make the subdivision a non-complying activity. Delete standard 2b in its entirety.	<b>Amend</b> standard 2 of SUB-RES-R27 as follows: <u>2. Where the parent allotment does not contain an existing residential unit:</u> <u>a. it must be demonstrated that it is practicable via a site plan layout that it is feasible to construct residential units on the parent allotment that comply with Rules GRZ-Rx1, GRZ-Rx2 or GRZ-Rx3;</u> <u>or</u> <u>b. the subdivision must comply with an approved land use resource consent.</u>  Undertake any <b>consequential amendments</b> to parts of the Plan to give effect to the relief sought.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.  Note that as part of the amendments recommended to the rule cascade (outlined in the body of the report), I have recommended deleting standards 1 and 2 from this rule.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R27. Refer section 10.7 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S202	S202.07	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Rx5, GRZ-Rx6	Support in part	Assessment against this is required for all development in the GRZ that do not comply with all standards, under matters of discretion for GRZ-Rx5 & GRZ-Rx6 but this guide is targeted at terraced/town houses and apartments only, stating that single dwellings, infill dwellings and semi-attached dwellings are permitted and not covered by the design guide (pg.3). The way this matter of discretion is worded is such that it would appear all non-compliant developments need to be assessed against this design guide, when the design is only applicable for those higher density developments. Would recommend rewording this matter of discretion to clarify this is only for higher density terraced/town houses and apartments.	<b>Amend</b> the matters of discretion under GRZ-Rx5 and GRZ-Rx6 as follows: <u>1. The relevant matters contained in the Residential Design Guide in Appendix x1 where higher-density development, such as apartments or terraced town houses for three or more attached residential units that are at least 2 stories, are proposed.</u>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	I agree with the submitter that the focus of the Residential Design Guide is on terraced housing and apartment typologies. This is made clear in section 4 of the Design Guide. I agree with the submitter that Matters of Discretion should be amended to acknowledge this, but in a different manner to that requested by the submitter.  Rule GRZ-Rx5 applies to development with 3 or fewer residential units that do not comply with one or more of bulk and location standards outlined under GRZ-Rx1 (standards 2 to 11) or GRZ-Rx2 (standard 2). For this rule, the key matter of discretion is 3: "consideration of the effects of the standard not met".  Rule GRZ-Rx6 applies to development with 4 or more residential units that complies with the bulk and location standards noted above. The Residential Design Guide is likely to be relevant to development under this rule, because developments with 4 or more residential units are likely to involve a range of typologies, including terraced housing and apartments.  I consider that the Residential Design Guide is unlikely to be relevant to development under rule GRZ-Rx5, as development with three or fewer residential units is unlikely to involve the typologies covered by the Design Guide, and the effects of breaching bulk and location standards are addressed through Matter of Discretion 3. On the other hand, the Design Guide is likely to be relevant to development under GRZ-Rx6 for the reasons stated above.  I consider that the clearest way to give effect to the relief sought by the submitter would be to delete Matter of Discretion 1 from rule GRZ-Rx5, but retain it as drafted under rule GRZ-Rx6.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend GRZ-Rx5.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend GRZ-Rx5. Refer section 4.28 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA Evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to GRZ-Rx5 is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA than the notified provision, because it improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the rule by removing a matter of discretion that is unlikely to be relevant to the rule.
S206.FS.9	S202.07.FS01	Landlink	GRZ-Rx5, GRZ-Rx6	Support primary submission	Note that the design guides focus may be considered narrow - terraced/townhouses and apartments. Also agree that the design guide use intent appears to be for 'higher density' developments and this should be clarified.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.08	Leith Consulting Ltd	SUB-DW-R9	Oppose	The building area dimensions under this rule should be reduced/reworded to better reflect the reduced size of allotments/buildings that will be enabled by the MDRS provisions. Otherwise, you will have many MDRS subdivisions (small allotments around existing or new residential buildings) that cannot comply with this outdated standard and will require a 'discretionary' resource consent for a subdivision that should only be a 'restricted discretionary' activity.	<b>Amend</b> standard 2 of SUB-DW-R9 as follows: <u>2. Proposed building areas with a minimum dimension of 20-9 metres must be identified for each vacant allotment or building areas that match detailed building plans submitted at the time of subdivision shall be identified.</u>	4.10.2 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Liquefaction	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-DW-R9. Refer to section 10.22 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S202	S202.09	Leith Consulting Ltd	Definitions	Not specified	Scope to ensure that the relief sought is not limited to certain parts of the plan as there may be flow on effects to other parts of the plan that are required to be changed to enable the relief requested.	<b>Add</b> definition or <b>change</b> definitions, where definitions are not a NPS definition, to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider any consequential amendments are necessary as part of the recommendations I have made on the matters raised by the submitter.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S202	S202.10	Leith Consulting Ltd	TR-R3	Oppose	To give effect to national direction and the MDRS standards TR-R3 should be amended to not require vehicle access over land to every site. Development should be able to provide suitable pedestrian access if the proposal/subdivision/development is not proposed to provide on-site car parking (which is no longer required).	<b>Amend</b> standards 1 and 2 of TR-R3 as follows: 1. Access - every site must provide vehicular or pedestrian access over land or by mutual right of way or service lane for parking and/or loading and shall be in accordance with TR-Diagram - 2 and XXX (insert applicable pedestrian access standard here) 2. Access - all vehicle accesses must meet the following ... .... A new pedestrian access policy may need to be added and as a consequence the existing objectives may need to be modified to give effect to the relief sought.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I agree that the rule should not require vehicle access to sites that do not include vehicle access or loading, and I consider that it is reasonable to provide an option for pedestrian access under these circumstances. I therefore consider that it would support the incorporation of the MDRS into the District Plan to amend the standard to enable the provision of pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access.  In relation to appropriate standards for pedestrian access, I consider it unnecessary to include standards for the design of pedestrian access, because I consider this matter to be regulated under clause D1 of the New Zealand Building Code (through standards outlined under Acceptable Solution D1/AS1). However, the Building Code does not prescribe requirements for legal pedestrian access to sites, so I consider it appropriate to include a standard for this purpose. I have reviewed the proposed District Plans of Porirua and Wellington City, both of which include a standard requiring a 1.8 metre legal width at the boundary for pedestrian access. I consider this to be reasonable and practicable, and note that this would provide sufficient space to achieve the requirements of Acceptable Solution D1/AS1 under the Building Code.  I consider this amendment to be consistent with clause 7 of policy TR-P2 and policy TR-PARK-P8, and I do not consider it necessary to make any consequential amendments to transport policies. However, I consider a range of minor consequential amendments are required to the standards under the rule in order to distinguish vehicle access standards from pedestrian access standard.  The recommended amendments are worded in a way that does not preclude vehicle access from being provided even where there is no vehicle parking or loading, as vehicle access may still be desirable from a practical perspective, or to comply with other statutory requirements (such as a where fire service vehicle access may need to be provided for in certain circumstances under the New Zealand Building Code). Where vehicle access is provided, it must continue to meet the design requirements for vehicle access specified under rule TR-R3.  I also consider that consequential amendments are required to standard 6 under rule SUB-RES-R26 and standard 7 under rule SUB-RES-R27.	<b>Accept.</b> Noting that I recommend a different structure to the amendment of the standards, as well as a range of consequential amendments. Refer to section 16.13 of PC(R1) for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend TR-R3. Refer section 16.13 of PC(R1). Amend standard 6 under SUB-RES-R26. Refer section 10.5 of PC(R1). Amend standard 7 under SUB-RES-R26. Refer section 10.6 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it supports incorporating the MDRS into the by providing for a pedestrian access alternative where vehicle access is not necessary. I also consider that the amendment is consistent with policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD, as the amendment contributes to enabling development to provide for active modes of transport.
S160.FS.2	S202.10.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	TR-R3	Oppose primary submission	The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kāpiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.  The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Disallow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S197.FS.1	S202.10.FS02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	TR-R3	Support primary submission	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission point as it provides for the benefits of retirement villages, recognises their functional and operational needs and is consistent with the NPSUD.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206.FS.9	S202.10.FS03	Landlink	TR-R3	Support primary submission	Support amendment to TR-3 (and any related subdivision rules if appropriate). In higher density urban environments where active sustainable transport modes are a focus, vehicle access over land to every site should not be a requirement. The need to ensure access/appropriate measures for firefighting purposes is acknowledged.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S202.10.FS04	Ryman Healthcare Limited	TR-R3	Support primary submission	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission point as it provides for the benefits of retirement villages, recognises their functional and operational needs and is consistent with the NPSUD.	Allow primary submission.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.11	Leith Consulting Ltd	Residential subdivision that breaches the minimum vacant allotment size - Activity Status	Oppose	Residential development in the Residential Zone is anticipated land use type for the residential zone and should be provided for in the Plan. Often adverse effects are known and can be defined with matters of discretion listed. Signalling that it is a 'non-complying activity' indicates that the activity is not anticipated by the Plan or appropriate which should not be the case considering National Discretion, the NPS for UD and the new MDRS provisions.	<b>Amend</b> the activity status for breaching the minimum residential vacant allotment size from Non-complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity Status and list the matters of discretion.  We support any consequential changes needed to the rest of the District Plan to give effect to the relief sought.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.  Note that as part of the amendments recommended to the rule cascade (outlined in the body of the report), subdivision that breaches minimum vacant allotment size in the General Residential Zone is a discretionary activity under amendments to rule SUB-RES-R30. Subdivision that breaches minimum vacant allotment size in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct continues to be a non-complying activity under SUB-RES-R32.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-RES-R30. Refer section 10.10 of PC(R1). Amend SUB-RES-R32. Refer section 10.12 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S206.FS.9	S202.11.FS01	Landlink	Residential subdivision that breaches the minimum vacant allotment size - Activity Status	Support primary submission	General advice (Quality Planning) outlines that 'the non-complying activity status is intended for situations where it is intended consents only be granted in exceptional circumstances'. Given the residential zoning and the potential permitted baseline through land use retaining a non-complying activity status for subdivision which do not meet minimum 450m lot size or 15m diameter circle.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.12	Leith Consulting Ltd	GRZ-Rx2	Oppose	There is plenty of commercial activity within these town centres to justify building up to six stories to align with Policy 3 of the NPS US 2020. It also makes economical and feasible sense to build a six storey building rather than a four storey building as both require lifts and similar inputs. Allowing up to six stories will help to achieve Kāpiti's housing bottom lines.  For projects of four or more floors construction costs increase significantly and typically estimate \$4,500/sqm as a rough guide. The increase in construction costs between lightweight structures and more intensive housing are reflected by the increased complexity of construction from both a design and engineering perspective. We note that contractors will have competitive pricing strategies and it is challenging to establish exactly what is included in the square metre rate.	<b>Amend</b> rules/planning maps and associated policies and objectives to enable up to 20 metres (6 storeys) in the Town Centre Zones at Ōtaki, Paraparaumu and Raumati Beach.  This would potentially require a change to Precinct B in the planning maps to exclude the Town Centre Zones as above and include them in Precinct A.  We support any consequential changes needed to the rest of the District Plan and planning maps to give effect to the relief sought.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that PC2 already enables buildings up to 6-storeys (21 metres) in the Town Centre Zone. This is enabled through: - DO-O16, UFD-Px and TCZ-P6, all of which seek that buildings up to 6-storeys are enabled in the Town Centre Zone. - Rule TCZ-R11, which provides for buildings up to 21 metres tall as a restricted discretionary activity.  I therefore do not consider any amendments are necessary to enable buildings up to 6-storeys in the Town Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S202	S202.13	Leith Consulting Ltd	INF-MENU-R27, Land Development Minimum Requirements	Oppose	If this rule is not updated to reference the proposed new external document that is incorporated by reference into the plan in other rules and chapters then there will be an internal conflict within the Plan.	<b>Amend</b> rule INF-MENU-R27 to reference the new 'incorporate by reference' document as follows: <b>Standards</b> 1. Development must be undertaken in accordance with the <b>Council's Subdivision and Development Principles and Requirements, 2012</b> . <b>Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements</b> .  We support any other <b>consequential changes</b> needed to the rest of the District Plan to fix errors that create inconsistencies and issues with plan interpretation.	4.9 MDRS & NPS-UD - Land Development Minimum Requirements	Section 16.1 of PC(N) replaces references to the SDPR with references to the LDNR across the District Plan. On this basis, the relief requested by the submitter is already provided by PC(N).	<b>Accept.</b> Noting that section 16.1 of PC(N) already provides for the submitter's request.	<b>No.</b>
S202	S202.14	Leith Consulting Ltd	NH-FLOOD-R3, SUB-DW-R7, Definitions	Support in part	NH-FLOOD-R3 standard 1 allows for the building floor level of buildings to be constructed above the 1% AEP flood event level as a permitted activity. If this is achieved for the buildings ahead of doing any subdivision, then any subdivision around the buildings should not be elevated to a potentially higher activity status because the ground level was not raised above the flood level when the house was built.  If it is the intention of Council to require the existing ground level to be raised above any modelled flood level via earthworks then NH-FLOOD-R3 should be amended to reflect this so there is not a disconnect between land use rules and subdivision rules.  Also 'building area' is not defined in the District Plan and should be for improved plan understanding and implementation.	Please <b>amend</b> SUB-DW-R7 as follows: <b>Standards</b> 1. Each <b>vacant</b> allotment shall have a building area located outside any river or stream corridor, overflow path or residual overflow path. 2. Each <b>vacant allotment's</b> building area shall be located above the estimated 1% AEP flood event level. 3. Formed vehicle access does not adversely affect the 1% AEP flood hazard risk on other properties in the same flood catchment. 4. Compliance with all other relevant subdivision rules and standards in other chapters.  Also <b>define</b> what is meant by 'building area'.  We support any <b>consequential changes</b> needed to the rest of the District Plan and planning maps to give effect to the relief sought.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	I agree that the standard should only apply to vacant allotments. Where allotments are developed prior to subdivision, then development will have been subject to the range of land use rules in the NH-FLOOD chapter, which address the matters covered by standards 1 and 2. I recommend a minor alteration to the amendment requested to standard 2, for grammar.  I do not consider it necessary to define "building area" in the District Plan, as I consider it is evident that it means, in the context of the standards, an area where a building may be located (the specifics of which can be determined, if necessary, through appropriate conditions or consent notices as part of the subdivision consent process).  In relation to the how compliance with land use rule NH-FLOOD-R3, this rule requires that the <b>building floor level!</b> (which is a defined term) is located above the 1% AEP flood event level, but it is agnostic on how this to be achieved. The rule does not require that this must be achieved through earthworks, and other conventional construction methods, such as raising a building above the flood level using pile or pole foundations could be used to comply with this rule.	<b>Accept in part.</b> By amending standards 1 and 2 under SUB-DW-R7.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend SUB-DW-R7. Refer to section 21.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more effective incorporation of the MDRS into the District Plan in relation to an existing qualifying matter, by avoiding reconsideration (under standards 1 and 2) of a matter that is already regulated under the land use rules in the NH-FLOOD chapter.
S206.FS.9	S202.14.FS01	Landlink	NH-FLOOD-R3, SUB-DW-R7, Definitions	Support primary submission	Support as per Landlink's primary submission and the points made - effects already established.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.15	Leith Consulting Ltd	Hydraulic Neutrality	Not specified	An important topic and requirement for development, being to achieve hydraulic neutrality, should be buried in another document but should be a clear rule in the District Plan. There is a policy regarding this requirement so a corresponding and clear rule in the Plan regarding this topic area is recommended. As more medium density developments are created, the need for hydraulic neutrality will become more important, especially since there may be an increasing issue with stormwater management and flooding in Kapiti due to the impacts of climate change.  The Council also need to consider a hydraulic neutrality rule and potentially adding/amending associated objectives and policies to provide a pathway forward for developments where hydraulic neutrality cannot be achieved but where there may be an opportunity for offsetting or compensating for any adverse effect associated with not meeting hydraulic neutrality.	<b>Update</b> the plan to better reflect the need to achieved hydraulic- neutrality at the time subdivision and building stage as this is an important requirement that is somewhat buried in the document incorporated by reference by the District Plan being the "Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements"  Make it <b>clear</b> in the rules in the District Plan that hydraulic neutrality needs to be achieved for development with notes on how this is to be calculated or measured.  A rule regarding hydraulic neutrality could be <b>added</b> to the Infrastructure Chapter, for example, as this where the policy INF-MENU-P17 is located. The implications of not being able to achieve hydraulic neutrality should be a restricted discretionary activity as any adverse effects can be defined.  We support any <b>consequential changes</b> needed to the rest of the District Plan and planning maps to give effect to the relief sought.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	I note that the requirement to achieve hydraulic neutrality is provided for under standards 1 and 2 rules SUB-DW-Rx1 (under PC(N)) and SUB-DW-R5 (in the operative District Plan and retained by PC(N)). I consider that the standards clearly specify the performance requirements to be achieved in relation to hydraulic neutrality. On this basis, I consider that hydraulic neutrality is provided for through district plan rules, and I do not consider it necessary to amend this approach.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206.FS.9	S202.15.FS01	Landlink	Hydraulic Neutrality	Support primary submission	There may be some sites where ground conditions or topography would make it difficult (but not impossible) to install soakage or attenuation infrastructure. So providing a pathway/defining a way to offset these impacts seems sensible.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.5.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - Infrastructure - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S202	S202.16	Leith Consulting Ltd	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Oppose	The Beach Residential Precincts are not clearly mapped in the planning maps and the existing beach residential rules are confusing in terms of how they apply with MDRS standards.	The District Plan still has references to rules regarding the Beach Residential Precincts. Please <b>delete/clarify</b> these rules as there is no corresponding precinct in the Eplan maps or they are not mapped in a clear way. This makes the plan confusing so please <b>clarify</b> these rules in the Plan and <b>delete</b> them where there is no applicable beach residential precinct mapped in the ePlan.  <b>Delete</b> Appendix 3 as it relates to beach residential precincts not mapped in the ePlan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The District Plan retains standards (as part of rules GRZ-R6 and SUB-RES-R27) for the Beach Residential Precincts where they are located within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. This is because the purpose of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is to retain the status quo level of development provided for by the operative District Plan until the management of coastal hazards is addressed through a future plan change. Outside of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, there are no rules associated with the Beach Residential Precincts. Rather, policies GRZ-P4 and GRZ-P5 apply to the consideration of resource consent applications for development that is not a permitted activity in the Beach Residential Precincts. This is explained in the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter, under the heading "Beach Residential Precincts".  The Beach Residential Precincts are identified as PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct in the ePlan maps, and PC2 does not propose to change this. Where Beach Residential Precincts are not identified in the District Plan Maps, then the policies (and rules in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct) associated with the Beach Residential Precincts do not apply.  In relation to Appendix 3 of the District Plan, I note that PC2 already proposes to remove this.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S202	S202.17	Leith Consulting Ltd	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and MDRS	Support in part	The District Plan should be able to be understand as a standalone document without any loopholes or gaps in understanding. Relying on external reports such as the s32 report for understanding is not good practice as the s32 report holds no legal weight once the plan is operative.  For example, is I wished to build medium density on the portion of the site that was not subject to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - would this be a permitted activity if all the MDRS standards are complied with?	<b>Update</b> the plan to improve useability to clarify how the coastal qualifying matter precinct is to be applied where it covers only half a site/property.  How are the MDRS to apply in this scenario? Please <b>update</b> the rule and policy framework to make this scenario clearer and add interpretation notes throughout the Plan to improve clarity.	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	There are instances at the edge of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, there will be sites which are partially located within the precinct. In these instances, the provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct will apply only to part of the site, whereas the provisions that incorporate the MDRS of give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD will apply to the remainder of the site, and the provisions would apply accordingly to each part of the site. How this is applied will vary depending on the site, the specific proposal, and the extent to which activities that are part of the proposal overlap the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and I consider that it is most appropriate that this be determined through the resource consent process (where resource consent is necessary).  I also consider that by the time PC2 becomes operative, there is likely to be familiarity with this approach, because it is similar to the approach of determining whether and how the provisions of PC2 have immediate legal effect (under section 86BA of the RMA) on sites where the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct applies.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S202	S202.18	Leith Consulting Ltd	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct and MDRS	Oppose	Updating the plan with interpretation notes throughout that help guide plan users to how rules should be applied will create a more useable plan with less opportunities for incorrect or differing interpretations of the same provisions.	Seeking clarity and an update to the plan to clarify these provisions.  If half a site is subject to the Coastal Qualifying Matter precinct and the other half of the site is not subject to the qualifying matter - do the MDRS standards have immediate legal effect for the portion of the site that is not subject to the Coastal Qualifying Matter precinct?	4.11.3 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Other Matters	There are instances at the edge of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, there will be sites which are partially located within the precinct. In these instances, the provisions related to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct will apply only to part of the site, whereas the provisions that incorporate the MDRS of give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD will apply to the remainder of the site, and the provisions would apply accordingly to each part of the site. How this is applied will vary depending on the site, the specific proposal, and the extent to which activities that are part of the proposal overlap the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and I consider that it is most appropriate that this be determined through the resource consent process (where resource consent is necessary).  I also consider that by the time PC2 becomes operative, there is likely to be familiarity with this approach, because it is similar to the approach of determining whether and how the provisions of PC2 have immediate legal effect (under section 86BA of the RMA) on sites where the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct applies.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose	The submission states that the timing of the full draft plan change being provided to them was not sufficient to get substantial iwi feedback.	Amend the Tangata Whenua consultation statement, because it can be seen that Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki were not appropriately involved in the broader design of the plan.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	If the submission is referring to the summary of engagement with tangata whenua outlined in section 3.4 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report, I consider this summary to be accurate. However, as outlined in the body of the report, I acknowledge that the constraints imposed on the Council and iwi by the legislation has led to a situation where Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki consider they have been unable to meaningfully participate in several aspects of the plan change.  In relation to the specific request, I do not consider it possible to amend a section 32 evaluation report through a submission on a plan change. Without wishing to minimise the concerns expressed by Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki on this matter, I recommend this request is not accepted on this basis.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Building heights	Oppose	The submission states several reasons (on pages 5 and 6), including (but not limited to): - Obligations to Tangata Whenua under other legislation including Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, the Local Government Act 2002, Treaty settlement legislation, iwi participation legislation and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. - The intent of Policy 1 of the NPS-UD is to enable Māori to live in urban environments that meet their needs for cultural expression. For example, enabling kaumātua and papakāinga housing, housing located in relation to the whenua and sites of cultural significance, or housing that enables whānau to undertake cultural practices. - Cultural values of Tangata Whenua should be included and more prominent than currently featured throughout the Plan. - The ability for whānau to live close to marae is important to the ongoing survival and maintenance of marae and the cultural wellbeing of the hapū. A large number of local whānau live very close to Raukawa Marae and Te Pou o Tainui Marae in existing traditional papakāinga areas. - The 'Marae Precinct' goes a very small way towards protecting the relationship of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki with their taonga. In order to protect the taonga of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki, it is important to pause the intensification process in Ōtaki. - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki are currently in Te Tiriti o Waitangi hearings processes and intensification before any negotiated settlement could disadvantage the parcels of land available within the rohe, creating prejudices.	Amend Plan Change 2 to limit intensification in Ōtaki to the current allowable building heights while: 1. KCDC seek legal advice from DIA about their obligations to mana whenua and to the Crown regarding breaches of Tiriti rights and protection of taonga including land parcels and waterways, especially when the Tiriti hearings process is underway (pre-settlement). 2. KCDC work with Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki to plan for development in Ōtaki in line with mana whenua aspirations for growth.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.03	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose	See submission point S203.02.	Amend Plan Change 2 as necessary to give more significance to, and use more explicit wording about, tangata whenua values and tikanga.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I acknowledge the matters raised, however as a general request I consider that a broader review of the District Plan may be required to address these matters. As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together on this matter as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.  However, I note that I have made recommendations elsewhere in response specific amendments requested by the submitter that may contribute towards this request.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.04	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support in part	As Ngāti Raukawa has not finalised its Treaty of Waitangi Settlement, it is inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from the rohe. The relationship of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki with their lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries.	Amend the Papakāinga provisions to provide for papakāinga in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed Use Zones, and do not restrict papakāinga on Kāpiti Island.	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. - Add three new rules (MCZ-Rx1, MCZ-Rx2 and MCZ-Rx3) to the Metropolitan Centre and Mixed Use Zones, accept in part in relation to the Local Centre Zone. Refer section 5.11 of PC2(R1). - Add three new rules (LCZ-Rx1, LCZ-Rx2 and LCZ-Rx3) to the Local Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 7.11 of PC2(R1). - Add three new rules (MUZ-Rx1, MUZ-Rx2 and MUZ-Rx3) to the Mixed Use Zone chapter. Refer section 8.10 of PC2(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.	Yes.
S161.FS.1	S203.04.FS01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission because provisions for papakāinga in these zones increases the opportunities for whānau who may have land in these zones and produces more potential papakāinga locations throughout the rohe.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.05	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki supports the submission of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai on Kārewarewa Urupā.	Refer to submission point S100.50.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S104.FS.1	S203.05.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	General	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203	S203.06	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Ōtaki	Oppose	The submission states several reasons (on pages 7 and 8), including (but not limited to): - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki was not invited to be involved in the decision to designate Ōtaki as a Future Urban Zone. - There is no robust population model for Ōtaki that takes into account the expected growth to the south of Ōtaki after the MDRS are enabled, and the likelihood that people will choose to live closer to Wellington. - The "Assessment of Kāpiti Coast Residential Intensification Area Feasibilities Report" (Appendix M to the S32 Report) states that feasibility modelling indicates that development in Ōtaki centres is unlikely to deliver a level of intensified residential development significantly beyond what the MDRS would deliver. - While there is a need for more housing in Ōtaki, the planned intensification goes far beyond what is required. - Ōtaki does not have sufficient services or infrastructure for future planned intensification. In particular, rapid transit services are not planned, the stormwater system is not suitable for the current population, and the sewerage system is at maximum capacity. - The risk and concerns are acknowledged by other government policy and objectives, including Te Mana o te Wai, the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity and the proposed change to the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	<b>Do not designate</b> Ōtaki as a Future Urban Zone until: 1. the population estimates are updated; and 2. meaningful participation and decision-making with mana whenua occurs for this matter.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S203.06.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Ōtaki	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.07	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Ōtaki	Oppose	The submission states that Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki criteria for growth is to ensure that waterways and the environment are nurtured always. Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki's aspiration is to grow to "live with the land, not on it".  Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki proposes several steps that it sees as critical to ensure that well functioning urban environments are achieved, including: 1. Clearly defining the level of population and development that waterways and the environment can safely sustain before any further intensification. 2. Complete a detailed development plan, including infrastructure development and building rules, before any intensification.  The submission notes that proceeding with intensification before these steps are taken is irresponsible and neglectful of their taonga.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to scale back intensification to a maximum of three storeys in town centres and two storeys in residential areas in Ōtaki, for the interim until work is undertaken to: 1. Clearly define the level of population and development that waterways and the environment can safely sustain before any further intensification. 2. Complete a detailed development plan, including infrastructure development and building rules, before any intensification.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S203.07.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Ōtaki	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.08	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose	See submission point S203.07.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to provide more scope for qualifying matters to better protect areas of importance to mana whenua.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that further developing the provisions related to existing qualifying matters would require a review of these provisions, and sufficient evidence to support any proposed amendments. I do not consider that there is sufficient information to provide for the this as part of the ISPP. However, I note that the Council is separately preparing several plan changes (including a "mana whenua" plan change) where there are opportunities to review the provisions related to areas of importance to mana whenua.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.09	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Infrastructure	Oppose	The submission states that infrastructure should be applied as a qualifying matter to Ōtaki, because: 1. Council is required to consult with iwi authorities and can exempt areas from the requirements of the MDRS and NPS-UD through applying a qualifying matter to protect the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga; and 2. provision of infrastructure is not guaranteed by the District Plan, nor is it in the power of the Council to ensure it is created in time.  Refer also to submission point S207.07.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to apply infrastructure as a qualifying matter to Ōtaki.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S203.09.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General - Infrastructure	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.10	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O3	Oppose	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki object to the proposed amendment as it removes their ability to be kaitiaki of their taonga. It is noted that these provisions are being made without three-waters infrastructure.  Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki recommend that the original word is maintained to protect their environment and wellbeing.	<b>Reject</b> the proposed amendment to proposed clause 6 of DO-O3.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S203.10.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-O3	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.11	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission identifies that the "local issues" section of the explanatory text to DO-O3 states that: "enable more people to live within Kāpiti's existing urban environments, particularly where these are well connected to transport, infrastructure, commercial activities and community services". The submission states that Ōtaki is not well connected to any of these things.  The submission notes that the "local issues" section also states: "recognise that some parts of the urban environment contain aspects of valued character that may be sensitive to change, and where appropriate include provisions that seek to help manage this change". Ōtaki is a nationally important and distinctive 'mātauranga Māori education zone' that is particularly sensitive to this type of intensification. Seeking growth that will intensify this once normal and now quite unique ahua puts the care and nurture of our important taonga, cultural values and tikanga at risk. It also removes our ability to be kaitiaki of our taonga.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to pause intensification in Ōtaki and work with mana whenua to grow in ways that care for our taonga, cultural values and tikanga.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S054.FS.1	S203.11.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-O3 (Explanatory Text)	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Waikanae East is not well connected.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.12	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-Ox2	Oppose	The submission states that blanket unplanned growth does not consider Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki housing needs that nurture the environment and maintain relationships with important cultural sites and practices.	Amend DO-Ox2 as necessary to ensure it does not allow for blanket, unplanned growth.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.13	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-Ox3	Oppose	The submission states that the objective fails to speak and link to papakāinga and tangata whenua aspirations for the future, and does not account for the impacts on Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.  The submission identifies that the objective does not cater to changing land use for tangata whenua when they receive land back through Settlement arrangements, and overrides the rights and interests of tangata whenua by overlaying a 'residential intensification precinct' without tangata whenua involvement.	Amend DO-Ox3 to ensure the role of tangata whenua in the residential intensification precinct, and provide for papakāinga.	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.14	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-Ox3	Oppose	The submission notes that the S32 Report identifies the expected yield from the additional building heights of four storeys in Ōtaki is expected to be minimal and is therefore quite unnecessary. The submission states that there is not a good evidence base in the appendix for this rule and that building heights and densities should reflect the relative demand for use and the level of accessibility from planned or existing active and public transport. The submission states that it doesn't make good sense to put additional stress in this already 'not well planned' area.  The submitter considers that they were not sufficiently involved in decisions about the extent of walkable catchments in Ōtaki.	Delete the proposed Residential Intensification Precincts in Ōtaki.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S203.14.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-Ox3	Support primary submission	Support this submission. This also applies to Waikanae East.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.15	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O11	Oppose	The submission states that tangata whenua values are not described in the amendments to objective DO-Ox11. 'Recognition' is not enough to protect taiao, marae, mahinga kai, awa, moana, papakāinga areas and Ōtaki waka mātauranga (education facilities and areas).	Reject the proposed amendments to DO-O11.  Review with mana whenua input. Stronger wording is required that protects cultural values and tikanga Māori. Specific wording to ensure Tangata Whenua values are in place for protections for and around 'Sites and Areas of significance to Māori and iwi' is requested. Mana Whenua would like to co-write this.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.16	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General - Amenity values	Oppose	Objective 4 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 provides that the District'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. This is referred to throughout Plan Change 2. The submission states that this does not appropriately recognise tangata whenua values.	Amend references to Objective 4 of the NPS-UD throughout Plan Change 2 to recognise tangata whenua values.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.17	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O11	Not specified	The submission requests that mahinga-kai are included under clause 5 of objective DO-O11.	Amend clause 5 of DO-O11 to refer to mahinga-kai.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Clause 5 of DO-O11 seeks "well managed interfaces between different types of land use areas (e.g. between living, working and rural areas and between potentially conflicting land uses), so as to minimise adverse effects". I consider mahinga-kai to be too specific a land used to be mentioned under such a broad objective. In any case, I consider that the broad and inclusive wording of the objective would provide for the consideration of land use in relation to mahinga-kai, where this is relevant.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.18	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Not specified	The submission states that paragraph 5 of the explanatory text to objective DO-O11 is particularly important to Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki. It begins with "Ōtaki has the role of a rural service town...".	Reject the proposed replacement of "maintaining" with "acknowledging" in paragraph 5 of the explanatory text to objective DO-O11.  Alternatively, use the term "maintaining and acknowledging".	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.19	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Not specified	The submission states that there is more to Ōtaki than what is described in the explanatory text to DO-O11. This includes the Māori area and people, taiao etc. marae, kohanga, kura, wananga – the desire is to grow the important and unique tikanga and Kaupapa expressions that are occurring in Ōtaki. These matters are nationally significant and play an important role in the cultural development of our country. The way Ōtaki grows is important to maintaining and supporting Kaupapa, tikanga and taonga.	Amend the final sentence of paragraph 5 of the explanatory text to DO-O11 to add the following text:  <u>The challenge for Ōtaki is maintaining acknowledging the overall character of the town and its local areas, in-particular the low key feel of the Ōtaki Beach Area while providing for increased housing variety and choice alongside increased access to public transport, commercial activities, tangata whenua cultural expression and community services.</u>	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider it appropriate to amend the wording of the explanatory text for the reasons stated by the submitter.	Accept.	Yes. Amend the explanatory text to DO-O11 (refer section 1.12 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides improved explanation of a matter of importance to tangata whenua.
S203	S203.20	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Not specified	See submission point S203.19.	In relation to paragraphs 1 and 5 of the explanatory text to DO-O11, <b>work together</b> with mana whenua to create appropriate wording.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.21	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-O16 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission states that there is not a strong evidence base for the centres' hierarchy applying in Ōtaki. Ōtaki is distinctly different to other areas in a number of ways.	Amend the explanatory text for DO-O16 to recognise that Ōtaki is distinctly different from other areas.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.22	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	DO-Ox5	Support	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki fully support the statement made in objective DO-Ox5.	Retain DO-Ox5 as notified.	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203	S203.23	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Papakāinga Chapter: Introduction	Support in part	The submission states that because Ngāti Raukawa has not finalised its Treaty of Waitangi Settlement, it is inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga locations from the rohe. The relationship of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki with their lands and waters is not limited by zoning boundaries.	<b>Amend</b> the Papakāinga provisions to provide for papakāinga in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed Use Zones.	4.3 Papakāinga	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Accept in relation to the Metropolitan Centre and Mixed Use Zones, accept in part in relation to the Local Centre Zone. Refer to the S42A report for details	<b>Yes.</b> - Add three new rules (MCZ-Rx1, MCZ-Rx2 and MCZ-Rx3) to the Metropolitan Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 5.11 of PC2(R1). - Add three new rules (LCZ-Rx1, LCZ-Rx2 and LCZ-Rx3) to the Local Centre Zone chapter. Refer section 7.11 of PC2(R1). - Add three new rules (MUZ-Rx1, MUZ-Rx2 and MUZ-Rx3) to the Mixed Use Zone chapter. Refer section 8.10 of PC2(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S097.FS.1	S203.23.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Papakāinga Chapter: Introduction	Support primary submission	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki state that it is inappropriate to exclude potential papakāinga from locations within the rohe as Ngāti Raukawa has not finalised its Treaty Settlement, and seek that papakāinga are provided for in the Metropolitan, Local Centres and Mixed use Zones. Greater Wellington support provisions that would enable the development of papakāinga as this has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, specifically Policy UD.2.	Allow primary submission.	4.3 Papakāinga	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.24	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PK-Px1	Not specified	The submission recommends adding the term 'tangata whenua' before whakapapa in policy PK-Px1.  Alternatively (or in addition) to the term 'tangata whenua', the submission queries whether A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangaitira) can be specified.	<b>Amend</b> PK-Px1 as follows:  <u>Papakāinga will be:</u> <u>1. provided for on land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993; and</u> <u>2. allowed on general title land where it can be demonstrated that there is a tangata whenua whakapapa or ancestral connection to the land, and the land will remain in Māori ownership.</u>  Alternatively (or in addition) to the term 'tangata whenua', specify 'A.R.T' (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangaitira).	4.3 Papakāinga	I consider that the amendment requested by the submitter would reinforce the objectives for papakāinga, which seek to recognise the and provide for the relationship between tangata whenua and their ancestral land.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend PK-Px1. Refer section 3.1 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA Evaluation</b> I consider this amendment to GRZ-Rx5 is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 than the notified provision and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a more effective policy that reinforces that the purpose of the papakāinga provisions is to provide for the relationship between tangata whenua and their ancestral land.
S203	S203.25	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PK-Px6 (Advice Note)	Support in part	The submission suggests clarifying who the iwi authorities are in the advice note.	<b>Amend</b> the advice note to add the following text after each reference to "iwi authority":  <a href="#">(Ngāti Toa Rangaitira, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) or Te Āti Awa ki Whakarongotai)</a>	4.3 Papakāinga	I agree that this would assist users of the provisions to understand what is meant by the term "iwi authority" in this context. I note that this is consistent with references to the same iwi authorities under the restricted discretionary activity standards for papakāinga on general title. However, for efficiency, I only consider it necessary to include the text sought by the submitter after the first reference to <i>iwi authority</i> in the advice note.  This advice note is repeated across all restricted discretionary activity rules for papakāinga, so I recommend that each occurrence of the note is updated.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Insert text after the first reference to <i>iwi authority</i> in the advice note.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend: - PK-Px6 (refer section 3.1 of PC(R1)) - GRZ-Rx9 and GRZ-Rx10 (refer sections 4.34 and 4.35 of PC(R1)) - TCZ-Rx2 and TCZ-Rx3 (refer sections 6.14 and 6.15 of PC(R1)) - GRUZ-Rx1 and GRUZ-Rx2 (refer sections 11.5 and 11.6 of PC(R1)) - RLZ-Rx1 and RLZ-Rx2 (refer sections 12.3 and 12.4 of PC(R1)) - RPROZ-Rx1 and RPROZ-Rx2 (refer sections 13.3 and 13.4 of PC(R1)) - FUZ-Rx1 and FUZ-Rx2 (refer sections 14.3 and 14.4 of PC(R1))  <b>Section 32AA Evaluation</b> I consider these amendments are a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 than the notified provision, because they provide for a more efficient interpretation of the advice note.
S203	S203.26	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General Residential Zone: Introduction	Oppose	The introduction to the General Residential Zone states that "a mix of housing densities are provided for throughout the Zone, with higher densities enabled in areas that are well served by public transport or are close to a range of commercial activities and community services". The submission states that Ōtaki is not well served in these respects.	Refer to submission points S203.07, S203.08 and S203.09.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Refer to submission points S203.07, S203.08 and S203.09.	Refer to submission points S203.07, S203.08 and S203.09.	Refer to submission points S203.07, S203.08 and S203.09.
S203	S203.27	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	The submission states that Residential Intensification Precinct B is not needed in Ōtaki and will put too much pressure on town centre that already has a few difficulties – stormwater, transport, street widths, traffic, drivability, parking etc.	<b>Do not designate</b> Ōtaki as a Future Urban Zone until: 1. the population estimates are updated; 2. phased development is in place as per the approach described in the introduction section that ensures taiao is cared for; and 3. meaningful participation and decision-making with mana whenua occurs for this matter.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.28	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that mana whenua were not invited to fully participate in this matter.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to extend the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I do not consider that there is sufficient information to justify extending the precinct.  However, I note that this recommendation does not preclude engagement between Council and tangata whenua on the development of appropriate coastal hazard provisions as part of the future coastal environment plan change.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.29	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PREC3 - Beach Residential Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that mana whenua were not invited to fully participate in this matter.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to extend the Beach Residential Precinct.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I do not consider that there is sufficient information to justify extending the precinct.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.30	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PREC8 - Waikanae Garden Precinct	Not specified	The submission states that mana whenua were not invited to fully participate in this matter.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to extend the Waikanae Garden Precinct.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I do not consider that there is sufficient information to justify extending the precinct.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203	S203.31	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	PREC13 - Ōtaki Low Density Housing Precinct	Oppose	The submission queries what the constraints associated with surface water are, and understands that they still exist. On this basis, it would be safest not to delete the precinct.	<b>Reject</b> the proposed deletion of PREC13 (Ōtaki Low Density Housing Precinct).	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Under the provisions of the Operative District Plan, PREC13 - Ōtaki Low Density Housing Precinct provides for a minimum allotment area of 800m2 (inclusive of access) and a minimum average allotment area of 950m2, under standard 2(e) of rule SUB-RES-R27. There are no other provisions in the Operative District Plan associated with this precinct.  I consider that the minimum allotment area required by the provisions for the Ōtaki Low Density Housing Precinct is inconsistent with the requirement that there be no minimum allotment size under clause 8 of Schedule 3A of the RMA. I also consider that constraints associated with surface water are appropriately addressed through the District Plan's flood hazard rules, which provide for restrictions on development in the area under PC(N) as an existing qualifying matter.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.32	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General Residential Zone: Introduction	Oppose	The submission states that tangata whenua cultural values are not considered by the removal of the following statement from the General Residential Zone introduction: "Given the distinctive qualities of these areas, it is important to ensure that new development is sensitive to its landscape setting and enhances the collective character, amenity value and public significance of each area."	<b>Amend</b> the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter to include effects on cultural values and tikanga Māori (after amenity value).	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.33	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Px2	Oppose	The submission opposes the way this policy has been interpreted and applied. The submission states that the ability to apply qualifying matters with regard to our culture, traditions and taonga was limited in this process so is being done in a way that does not nurture and protect the taonga of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to pause intensification for Ōtaki. This could be achieved by: - not applying the designation of "Future Urban Zone" to Ōtaki; or - extending the Marae Takiwā precinct across the Ōtaki area; or - applying an infrastructure qualifying matter to Ōtaki; or or a combination of the above.	4.2.3 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of the MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD at Ōtaki	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.34	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Px2	Oppose	See submission point S203.33.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to restrict building heights and require notification in close proximity to kohanga, kura, and wānanga, including any childcare or education facilities.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I do not consider that there is sufficient information to justify these matters as a qualifying matter in the terms required by sections 771 and 77J(3) of the RMA, in relation to these areas.  While I acknowledge that these sites are of significance to tangata whenua, I note that the operative District Plan framework for sites and areas of significance to Māori is unlikely to be appropriate to recognise these kinds of sites. As noted in the body of the report, as part of addressing this matter there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together on a broader review of sites and areas of significance to Māori as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.35	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Px6	Oppose	The submission states that Residential Intensification Precincts are not needed in Ōtaki. As a robust tikanga Māori catchment assessment work has not been undertaken for the area there is no evidence to show that our taiao can cope with this level of intensification. The submission states that with current infrastructure it is irresponsible to proceed in this way.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to apply infrastructure as a qualifying matter to Ōtaki.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.36	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Px7	Support in part	The submission states that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is a sensible approach, and it is not clear why the Council could not take a similar approach with infrastructure and the water table.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to apply infrastructure as a qualifying matter to Ōtaki.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.37	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-Px8	Support in part	The submission supports the Marae Takiwā precinct, but seeks that it be extended further.	<b>Amend</b> the Marae Takiwā precinct boundary to extend it over a wider area to protect a 'traditional' papakāinga area close to the marae.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	As I understand it, the submitter is referring to an area of housing between Rangatira Street and Iki Street (two blocks south of Raukawa marae).  The Marae Takiwā Precinct manages the adverse effects that may result from increased heights and densities of development on sites adjacent to marae. I therefore do not consider it appropriate to extend the precinct to an area that is not adjacent to the Marae.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.38	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-P1	Oppose	The submission opposes the deletion of policy GRZ-P1 (Medium Density Housing), and the reference to sufficient infrastructure capacity. Infrastructure and transport are important, and too much growth without these is irresponsible.	<b>Delete</b> PREC2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) in Ōtaki.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S203.38.FS01	Jonas, Malu	GRZ-P1	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.39	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-P3	Oppose	The submission opposes the deletion of policy GRZ-P3 (Special character areas). The distinct identity and special character of Ōtaki are integral aspects of its ahua. Deleting the policy does not recognise tangata whenua values and contravenes some of the policies and objectives of the legislation.	<b>Reject</b> the proposed deletion of GRZ-P3.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.40	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-P4	Support in part	The submission identifies that the proposed amendments to policy GRZ-P4 (Beach residential precincts) refer to "maintaining, where practicable" or "retaining, where practicable" existing dune landforms and existing mature trees and areas of extensive vegetation. The submission states that "practicable" feels a bit meaningless.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-P4 to strengthen protections existing dune land forms, existing mature trees and areas of extensive vegetation in Beach Residential Precincts.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.41	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GRZ-P9	Oppose	The submission opposes the deletion of "relate to local built identity, character values, and density of the surrounding residential environment", as it removes the ability for Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki to be kaitiaki of their taonga.	<b>Reject</b> the proposed deletion of "relate to local built identity, character values, and density of the surrounding residential environment" from the policy.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.42	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P2	Not specified	The submission relates to Precinct C, clauses b, c and d. The submission states that it is unclear how tangata values are considered as part of these policies, and they are considered to remove the ability for Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki to be kaitiaki of their taonga.	<b>Amend</b> MCZ-P2 to require resource consent, including the creation or approval of a Cultural Impact Assessment by tangata whenua.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I do not consider it appropriate to require a cultural impact assessment in all circumstances. However, where resource consent is required for new development in the Metropolitan Centre Zone under rule MCZ-R13, I consider that there are several matters of discretion under which effects on tangata whenua values could be considered where these are relevant to the application. In these cases, it would be open to the Council, when assessing the effects of the activity, to request (or commission) a cultural impact assessment if this was considered necessary to assess the effects.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.43	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	MCZ-P5	Not specified	The submission identifies that amendments to the policy propose that local and on-site amenity values are maintained and enhanced "where practicable". The submission states that tangata whenua were not asked about this or invited to codesign.	<b>Work together</b> to amend this policy.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that the amendments contained in PC(N) to MCZ-P5 are consistent with Objective 4 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.44	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-Px1	Not specified	The submission notes that it would be appropriate to not enable level of intensification in Ōtaki until the infrastructure and care of taiao and taonga is addressed according to Kaupapa and tikanga Māori.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to not enable intensification in Ōtaki until infrastructure and care of taiao and taonga are addressed according to Kaupapa and tikanga Māori.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.45	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-Rx3	Support in part	The submission supports the provision, but suggests that A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira) are specified.	<b>Amend</b> the provision to specify for A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira).	4.3 Papakāinga	I consider this matter is addressed through the recommendation for submission point S203.25.	<b>Accept.</b>	See S203.25.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203	S203.46	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	TCZ-Rx4	Support	The submission supports this new rule, in particular matter of discretion 2: "effects on cultural values and tikanga Māori".	<b>Amend</b> TCZ-Rx4 to add "effects on cultural values and tikanga Māori" after the term <i>amenity value</i> throughout the plan, or work together to ensure the plan appropriately incorporates statements to account for cultural values and tikanga Māori.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.47	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-Rx1	Not specified	The submission recommends that water tanks be included for all new allotments.	<b>Amend</b> SUB-DW-Rx1 to require water tanks for all new allotments.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider the amendment sought to be unnecessary, because rule INF-MENU-R28 already requires water tanks to be provided for all new or relocated residential buildings.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.48	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-Rx1	Not specified	The submission states that to assist infrastructure, standard 5 of SUB-DW-Rx1 should also include stand alone sewerage tanks.	<b>Amend</b> standard 5 under rule SUB-DW-Rx1 to include stand alone sewerage tanks.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that stand alone sewerage tanks are appropriately provided for under standard 10 of rule SUB-RES-Rx1.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.49	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES-R26, SUB-RES-R27, SUB-RES-Rx1, SUB-WORK-R36, SUB-WORK-R37, SUB-WORK-R39, SUB-WORK-R40, SUB-WORK-R41, SUB-WORK-R42, SUB-WORK-R43, SUB-WORK-R44	Not specified	The submission recommends matters of control and discretion under several subdivision provisions are amended to include "natural wetlands" and "tangata whenua sites of significance".	<b>Amend</b> the relevant matters of control or discretion [identified in brackets] under the following rules SUB-RES-R26[8], SUB-RES-R27[8], SUB-RES-Rx1[8], SUB-WORK-R36 [5], SUB-WORK-R37[5], SUB-WORK-R39[5], SUB-WORK-R40[5], SUB-WORK-R41[5], SUB-WORK-R42[5], SUB-WORK-R43[5] and SUB-WORK-R44[5] as follows:  ... The location of any associated building area(s) relative to any identified natural hazards, natural wetlands, historic heritage feature, tangata whenua sites of significance, notable tree, ecological site, key indigenous tree, rare and threatened vegetation species, geological feature, outstanding natural feature and landscape or area of high natural character. ...	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that the amendments requested are consistent with the approach to qualifying matters taken by PC2. However, in lieu of the term "tangata whenua sites of significance", I consider that the term "places or areas of significance to Māori" is more appropriate, because this is a defined term in the District Plan.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Using the term "places or areas of significance to Māori" in lieu of "tangata whenua sites of significance".	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the rules noted by the submitter (refer sections 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 10.14, 10.15, 10.16, 10.17, 10.18, 10.19, 10.20 and 10.21 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider these amendments are a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because they provide for a clearer interpretation of the matters of discretion, in a manner that is consistent with the approach to qualifying matters taken under PC2.
S097.FS.1	S203.49.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	SUB-RES-R26, SUB-RES-R27, SUB-RES-Rx1, SUB-WORK-R36, SUB-WORK-R37, SUB-WORK-R39, SUB-WORK-R40, SUB-WORK-R41, SUB-WORK-R42, SUB-WORK-R43, SUB-WORK-R44	Support primary submission	Ngāi Hapū o Ōtaki seek changes to a number of subdivision rules to specify in the matters of control or discretion, the location of any building area relative to natural wetlands and tangata whenua sites of significance. Greater Wellington support the proposed amendments as they will ensure effects of subdivision of natural wetlands and sites of significance to tangata whenua are considered at the subdivision consent stage.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.50	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	The submission identifies that the advice note for rule SUB-RES-R26 states that subdivision within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct at Te Horo Beach and Ōtaki Beach are provided for under rule SUB-RES-R27. However standards 1 and 2 under rule SUB-RES-R27 state that they do not apply to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to clarify why standards 1 and 2 of SUB-RES-R27 do not apply to the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Standards 1 and 2 do not apply in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, because the maximum capacity of residential allotments in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is managed under the minimum allotment size standard contained under SUB-RES-Table x1, which works in combination with the maximum number of residential units allowed on an allotment in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct outlined under standard 1 of rule GRZ-R6.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.51	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-RES-R27	Not specified	The submission recommends including a standard for water before wastewater, and requiring water tanks to be included.	<b>Amend</b> the standards under rule SUP-RES-R27 to include a standard for water and water tanks.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that standards 4 and 5 of SUB-DW-R5 appropriately addresses water and wastewater, and that rule INF-MENU-R28 appropriately addresses the need for water tanks. I therefore do not consider it necessary to include additional standards for these matters under SUB-RES-R27.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203	S203.52	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Financial Contributions: Introduction	Not specified	The submission recommends adding the following note to the introduction to the Financial Contributions chapter: "Note: Council will consult with the relevant iwi authority/ies in relation to assessing financial and/or development contributions made under this Plan relevant to cultural values."	<b>Amend</b> the introduction to the Financial Contributions Chapter to include the following text at the end of the chapter:  <i>Note: Council will consult with the relevant iwi authority/ies in relation to assessing financial and/or development contributions made under this Plan relevant to cultural values.</i>	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	I consider that adding the advice note in response to S161.42 addresses this point. Note that for the reasons stated under submission point S161.42, I have recommended different wording to that suggested by the submitter.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer S161.42.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer S161.42.
S203	S203.53	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FC-P3	Not specified	The submission states that there should only be financial contributions to offset or compensate for adverse effects to the environment if remedies or mitigation have not been effective first, making offsetting or compensation the only remaining options.	<b>Amend</b> FC-P3 as follows:  <i>A financial contribution may be required for any land use or subdivision application to ensure positive effects on the environment are achieved to offset any adverse effects that cannot otherwise be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i>	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	I consider that the policy as worded achieves the outcome sought by the submitter. Removing the words "remedied or mitigated" may be counterproductive, as it would suggest that financial contributions to provide for offsetting could occur in lieu of remediation or mitigation, which is not what is intended.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S203.53.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	FC-P3	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S203.53.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	FC-P3	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.54	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	FC-R5	Not specified	The submission recommends additional wording in standard 3 of FC-R5 to provide an option for vesting land to tangata whenua. The submission also queries whether references to local authorities in standard 3(d) should also include references to iwi authorities.	<b>Amend</b> standard 3 of FC-R5 as follows:  ... <i>d. Where a financial contribution is, or includes land, the Council may specify any one or more of the following in the conditions of the resource consent:</i> <i>i. The location and area of the land.</i> <i>ii. The state the land is to be in before vesting in or transferring to the Council.</i> <i>iii. The purpose of the land if it is to be classified under the Reserves Act 1977, or the general purpose of the land.</i> <i>iv. When and how the land is to be vested in or transferred to the Council, tangata whenua, or other infrastructure provider. In the case of subdivision consent the land shall be vested on the deposit of the survey plan under section 224 of the Act, or transferred as soon as legal certificate of title is available.</i> <i>e. Where any land is to be vested in Council, tangata whenua, or other infrastructure provider as part of a financial contribution, a registered valuer shall determine its market value at the date on which the resource consent (imposing the financial contribution condition) commenced under section 116 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</i> ...	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	It is not clear to me in what circumstances land would (or could) be vested in tangata whenua as part of a financial contribution. However I also do not think that it is appropriate to preclude this as an option. Rather than specifying tangata whenua, I consider it more appropriate to amend the standard so that it does not specify any party. This retains flexibility for the appropriate party to be determined in the circumstances of the consent application.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Amend the standard to remove references to "Council or other infrastructure provider".	<b>Yes.</b> Amend FC-R5 (refer section 15.3 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a more efficient interpretation of the standard. I also consider it to be consistent with Policy 9(c) of the NPS-UD because it does not preclude the consideration of tangata whenua as a party.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S197.FS.1	S203.54.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	FC-R5	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S203.54.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	FC-R5	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.55	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	INF-MENU-R29	Not specified	The submission queries whether the requirements under INF-MENU-R29 to provide a potable water supply and water tank should apply to all properties in the General Residential Zone, due to the issue of water shortages.	Amend Plan Change 2 to require a potable water supply and water tanks for all new residential buildings in the General Residential Zone.	4.2.5 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Infrastructure	Water tanks are already required for new residential buildings in the General Residential Zone under rule INF-MENU-R28.  Residential buildings are required to be provided with a potable water supply under the Building Act 2004, under clause G12 of the New Zealand Building Code. I therefore do not consider it necessary to provide for the same matter under the District Plan.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.56	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	CF-R3	Not specified	The submission recommends including tangata whenua sites of significance as a matter of discretion for community facilities.	Amend matter of discretion 9 under rule CF-R3 as follows: ... 9. Effects on historic heritage and tangata whenua sites of significance. ...	4.3 Papakāinga	I note that the District Plan definition of historic heritage feature includes sites and areas of significance to Māori outlined under Schedule 9. I therefore consider it consistent with the intent of the matter of discretion that it includes reference to places and areas of significance to Māori (which is a defined term in the district plan). This would assist users of the provision to be aware that effects on places and areas of significance to Māori are included within the scope of effects on historic heritage more broadly.	Accept in part. Referring to "places and areas of significance to Māori" instead of "tangata whenua sites of significance".	Yes. Amend CF-R3 (refer section 16.10 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA Evaluation I consider this amendment to be a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA than the notified provision, because it provides for a more efficient and effective interpretation of the matter of discretion.
S203	S203.57	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Schedule 9	Not specified	The submission states that education facilities that teach Te Reo Māori and Mātauranga Māori should be included as sites and areas of significance to Māori in Schedule 9.	Amend Schedule 9 to include education facilities that teach Te Reo Māori and Mātauranga Māori as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	While I acknowledge that the submitter considers these facilities to be sites of significance, I do not consider that they fit appropriately within the Sites and Areas of Significance framework outlined under Schedule 9 of the District Plan. The framework is principally designed to protect sites of significance from effects associated with land disturbance and development on the site. I am concerned that incorporating such facilities into the current Sites and Areas of Significance framework would restrict the ability for tangata whenua to alter or further develop these facilities, should they wish to do so. I therefore do not consider it appropriate to incorporate such facilities into Schedule 9.  However, as noted in the body of the report, as part of addressing this matter there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together on a broader review of sites and areas of significance to Māori as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S161.FS.1	S203.57.FS01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira	Schedule 9	Support primary submission	Support this submission because including these facilities as sites and areas of significance to Māori will ensure that they are protected in alignment with tikanga and cultural values.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.58	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Schedule 9	Support in part	The submission supports the submission to Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai to extend the boundary of the Kārewarewa Urupā consistent with the original survey.	Refer to submission point S100.50.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Support is noted.	Accept. Refer to S100.50 for details.	Yes. Refer to S100.50 for details.
S104.FS.1	S203.58.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	Schedule 9	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203	S203.59	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Definitions: QUALIFYING MATTER AREA	Not specified	The submission recommends amending the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA to include wetlands and infrastructure.	Amend the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA to include wetlands and infrastructure.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that it would be consistent with the approach that PC(N) has taken to existing qualifying matters for the definition of Qualifying Matter Area to include reference to "separations from waterbodies". The evaluation contained in Appendix D of the Section 32 Evaluation Report identifies the rule NH-FLOOD-R2, which provides for separations from waterbodies, as an existing qualifying matter. By referring to waterbodies, this would include natural wetlands.  For the reasons outlined in the body of the report, I do not consider appropriate to provide for infrastructure as a qualifying matter.	Accept in part. Amend the definition to include separations from waterbodies as provided for under rule NH-FLOOD-R2.	Yes. Amend the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA (refer section 20.11 of PC(R1)).  Section 32AA evaluation I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it better aligns the definition with the approach taken by PC(N) to existing qualifying matters.
S203	S203.60	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	NH-FLOOD-R2	Not specified	The submission states that standards 1 and 2 under rule NH-FLOOD-R2 (relating to separations from waterbodies) should apply to wetlands.	Amend standards 1 and 2 of NH-FLOOD-R2 to apply to wetlands.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I do not consider this amendment to be necessary, as the definition of waterbodies (to which the rule applies) includes wetlands. Standards 1 and 2 of NH-FLOOD-R2 therefore already apply to wetlands.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.61	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-R7	Not specified	The submission states that the standards under rule SUB-DW-R7 should apply to land that contains wetlands.	Amend rule SUB-DW-R7 to apply to land that contains wetlands.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	The rule is intended to manage the effects of subdivision in relation to flood hazards (not wetlands per se), so I do not consider it appropriate to include specific reference to land that contains wetlands under the rule.  However, I note that in response the submitters submission point S203.49, I have recommended that the location of building areas relative to any natural wetlands is included as a matter of control or discretion across the range of rules that provide for subdivision in the Residential and Working Zones.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.62	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-R6	Not specified	The submission states that the subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes and on land which contains ecological sites or geological features should consider tangata whenua cultural values.	Amend rule SUB-DW-R6 to include "tangata whenua cultural values" as a matter of discretion.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that matter of discretion (2) provides for the consideration of tangata whenua cultural values already. I also note the values associated with outstanding natural features and landscapes identified in Schedule 4 (which is referenced in matter of discretion (2)) includes "values to tangata whenua".  I therefore do not consider it necessary to amend the matters of discretion to provide for tangata whenua cultural values, because I consider this is already provided for.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203	S203.63	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	NFL-R3	Not specified	The submission states that buildings within outstanding natural features and landscapes should consider tangata whenua cultural values.	Amend rule NFL-R3 to include "tangata whenua cultural values" as a matter of discretion.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that matter of discretion (4) provides for the consideration of tangata whenua cultural values already. This refers to outstanding natural features and landscapes identified in Schedule 4, which includes reference to "values to tangata whenua".  I therefore do not consider it necessary to amend the matters of discretion to provide for tangata whenua cultural values, because I consider this is already provided for.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.64	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	GIZ-R5	Not specified	The submission notes the first sentence within the table "except in the Ōtaki South Precinct". This table applies to Industrial zones and measurement criteria including height. The submission states that it is concerning that no restrictions appear to be in place for the Ōtaki industrial zone.	Amend Plan Change 2 to apply the bulk and location standards under rule GIZ-R5 to the Ōtaki Industrial Precinct.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	This area is referred to in the District Plan as PREC32 - Ōtaki South Precinct. Under standard 1 of rule PREC32-R1, the bulk and location standards outlined under rule GIZ-R5 apply to new buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings in the Ōtaki South Precinct. I consider it unnecessary to amend the District Plan in the manner requested by the submitter, because the outcome sought by the submitter is already provided for through existing rules.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.65	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	SUB-DW-Table 1	Not specified	The submission states that esplanade reserves involving the bed of a river, lake or the coastal marine area should the option to vest in tangata whenua, in addition to the Council or Crown. The submission notes that in the context of current Treaty of Waitangi Settlements and negotiations within this region it is pre-emptive to assume ownership only lies with the Kawanatanga Partners.	Amend the "Bed of River, Lake or Coastal Marine Area" row of SUB-RES-Table 1 as follows: <i>Where subdivision includes a river, stream or lake the bed of the river, stream or lake shall vest in Council, or tangata whenua. Where subdivision includes the Coastal Marine Area, the bed of the Coastal Marine Area shall vest in the Crown or tangata whenua.</i>	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I do not consider it appropriate to amend the provision to include reference to tangata whenua, because this would not be consistent with section 237A of the RMA.  I observe that the second part of the provision (which refers to the bed of the coastal marine area) is technically incorrect and does not reflect the requirements under section 237A, but I consider it beyond the scope of the submission to address this.	Do not accept.	No.
S203	S203.66	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Design Guides	Not specified	The submission raises several points related to the Design Guides (pages 25 and 26 of the submission).  The submission notes the need to develop and include design criteria that are specific to Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki and the ART confederation. Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki want to see themselves reflected in the district, not just in papakāinga. The inclusion of tangata whenua cultural expressions in the design guides will enhance and benefit the entire community.  The submission includes comments on the design principles, and identifies that Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki should provide input into public design/landscaping, facade design, connectivity and visual corridors.  The submission makes several recommendations in relation to the design guides (submission points S203.66 - 69).	Establish a Design Panel with tangata whenua representatives and include a trigger in the plan for Design Panels to be consulted.	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address this matter as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.67	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Design Guides	Not specified	Refer submission point S203.66.	Prepare localised guidelines with tangata whenua for each town centre/metropolitan area etc.	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address this matter as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.68	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Design Guides	Not specified	Refer submission point S203.66.	Amend Plan Change 2 to provide that the careful consideration of the design of new development and how it will impact sites and areas of significance to Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki is given more priority and is present in more criteria than the "Responding to Context" section of the Design Guides.	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address this matter as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.69	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Design Guides	Oppose	Refer submission point S203.66.	Amend the proposed design guidelines to increase awareness and acknowledgement of Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki and tangata whenua context throughout the design guides.	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address this matter as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	Do not accept. Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	No.
S203	S203.70	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	District Plan Maps	Not specified	The submission states that the District Plan maps do not identify what area they relate to so are difficult to utilise.	Amend the District Plan Maps as required to give effect to the decisions sought by Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I do not consider that the recommendations I have made in relation to the matters raised by the submitter require amendments to the District Plan maps.	Do not accept.	No.
S244.FS.1	S203.FS01	McDonald, Deidre	Full submission	Support primary submission	Strongly support these submissions and have a particular concern with the lack of partnering with Tangata Whenua by KCDC. This is a fundamental constitutional flaw in the process and must be corrected before KCDC can legitimately proceed with its proposal. Agree with their recommendation that KCDC seeks legal advice with respect to their obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Strongly support the submission that infrastructure should be a qualifying matter for Ōtaki, and that more scope should be afforded the qualifying matters with respect to mana whenua. Intensification be limited to single story dwellings while points 1 & 2 in their submission occur. This process should be paused until KCDC works with Mana Whenua.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S203.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission. The mental health of homeless and badly housed people is very important, as is the mental health of people currently living on the Kapiti Coast. Neither group should take precedence. All people need access to housing, services, social connections, and places to spiritually replenish.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S204	S204.01	Peacock, David	TCZ-R6, TCZ-R11	Oppose	The submission opposes the proposed 21 metre building height the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone. Allowing a 21 metre maximum height would potentially spoil the existing heritage and cultural character of the streetscape.	Amend the height limit within the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone to be a maximum of 2 storeys in height.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested would be inconsistent with the requirement for the District Plan to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, which requires the District Plan to enable building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services planned for Town Centre Zone.  In relation to the existing heritage and cultural character of the streetscape at Ōtaki, I note that buildings taller than 3-storeys will require resource consent and will be subject to the considerations outlined in the Centres Design Guide. Guidelines 71 to 75 seek that new development in the centres zones responds to its context, including the streetscape. In particular, guidelines 74 and 75 provide that where development is adjacent to a heritage building or near a site or area of significance to Māori, the development gives consideration to a range of factors in relation to the adjacent heritage building or site. I also note that existing scheduled heritage buildings will continue to be protected by the rules contained in the HH - Historic Heritage chapter of the District Plan.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S204	S204.02	Peacock, David	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	The submission opposes the proposed 14 metre (4-storey) maximum building height in the residential area around the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone. 4-storey buildings in and amongst one and two storey dwellings would result in privacy and shading issues.	<b>Amend</b> the height limit within the residential area surrounding the Ōtaki Main Street Town Centre Zone to be a maximum of 2 storeys in height.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I consider that the amendment requested would be inconsistent with the requirement for the District Plan to give effect to Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD, which requires the District Plan to enable, in areas adjacent to the Town Centre Zone, building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activities and community services planned for Town Centre Zone.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S205	S205.01	Classic Developments NZ Limited	Poplar Avenue, Raumati South	Not specified	The submission relates to the proposed rezoning of sites around 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue.  The submission identifies several reasons why extending the proposed rezoning (to General Residential Zone) of the land would be appropriate, including (but not limited to): - The land is located next to an urban area and parts of it are already proposed to be rezoned by PC2. - Existing rules are capable of managing the relevant risks. The submitter intends to retain and protect approximately 81,502m2 of the site for ecological enhancements, stormwater control and more appropriate land uses. - The S32 report notes that there would be limited benefit in structure planning the area. - Extending the rezoning would contribute to plan-enabled housing supply and would regularise and rationalise the rezoning pattern of the surrounding area.	<b>Amend</b> the proposed rezoning at 39 Rongomau Lane, & 99-105 Poplar Avenue to include the following sites as General Residential Zone (identified in figure 1 contained in the submission) in their entirety: - Matai Road (Section 2 SO 508397); - Matai Road (Sections 1 and 2 SO 537569); - Matai Road (Sections 29-30 & 36 SO 505426); - 29 Harry Shaw Way (Section 37 SO 505426).	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	The submitter requests a number of sites be included in areas proposed to be rezoned through PC(N). I note that majority of the sites sought to be rezoned by the submitter are already zoned General Residential under the operative District Plan. I focus my assessment on those sites not already zoned General Residential - Poplar Ave and Rongamau Lane.  99-105 Poplar Avenue The submitter has requested a large parcel of land adjoining Poplar Ave be rezoned General Residential Zone. This piece of land is 9 ha. in size, and largely covered by a wetland. While this (along with other site constraints) can be managed by existing District Plan provisions and the provisions of the NES-F, this means the site is unlikely to be able to provide a notable contribution to plan-enabled housing. The submitter has also indicated in their submission, that they plan to retain and protect the majority of this site as "ecological enhancements, stormwater control and more appropriate land uses". I consider that this can be generally achieved under the operative District Plan zoning (General Rural Zone). Therefore, I do not consider the rezoning requested to be necessary or appropriate.  39 Rongamau Lane The submitter has requested two pieces of land adjoining Rongamau Lane be rezoned to General Residential Zone. This piece of land is 3.9 ha. in size, and is adjacent to the Kapiti Expressway. Part of these two sites is proposed to be rezoned by PC(N). The remainder of the area not included in proposed rezoning is located within the NZTA-005 designation (state highway purposes). On that basis, I do not consider it appropriate to rezone these properties.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S205.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	Poplar Avenue, Raumati South	Oppose primary submission	The proposed rezoning of land is next to an expressway. The health and amenity to future occupants living next to the expressway should be considered and managed, as well as access arrangements.  Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.	Disallow primary submission point. Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S205.01.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Poplar Avenue, Raumati South	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S205.01.FS03	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Poplar Avenue, Raumati South	Support primary submission	Insufficient information has been provided in the submission to adequately assess the effects of the proposal. Avoid pre-empting Takutai Kāpiti decisions for those sites close to the coast. KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change. Seek further assessment of environmental effects, including s6 RMA matters and cumulative effects of rezoning all or some of the proposed sites or deferring for future plan change.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206	S206.01	Landlink	General	Support in part	Landlink do not believe the rezoning of 13 small residential areas is substantial enough to give effect to policies 2 and 3 and provide adequate development opportunity to meet shorter - and medium-term housing demand.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to include additional areas for rezoning to General Residential Zone.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S054.FS.1	S206.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S203.FS.1	S206.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Oppose primary submission	KCDC has a Future urban development plan change scheduled as part of implementing the District Growth Strategy. It may be more appropriate to consider submitter's requests for rezoning as part of that plan change.	Disallow primary submission.	4.15 Rezoning - Submissions on rezoning proposed as part of PC(N)	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S206	S206.02	Landlink	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Not specified	No specific reasons given.	<b>Amend</b> PRECx2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) to include the following sites: - 237 Rangiu Road, Ōtaki; - 255 Rangiu Road, Ōtaki.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the District Plan maps. Refer to section 19.10 and Appendix F of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S206	S206.03	Landlink	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Oppose	Landlink oppose the bakery residential intensification precinct (Waikanae Beach Local Centre Zone) and do not believe proposed residential Intensification Precinct B (Centring from Local Street on Ono Street/Te Moana Road/Rangiora Street) is the most appropriate location for intensification. Landlink consider the Ngārara Centre Zone a significantly better placed focal point for intensification for the area and a larger site.	<b>Delete</b> PRECx2 (Residential Intensification Precinct B) located around the Waikanae Beach Local Centre Zone, and <b>replace</b> with a Residential Intensification Precinct applied around the "Ngārara Development Area - Waimeha Neighbourhood Development Area Local Centre".	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matters I and J in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S206.03.FS01	Jonas, Malu	PRECx2 - Residential Intensification Precinct B	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206	S206.04	Landlink	SUB-DW-R7	Not specified	See submission point S206.07.	<b>Amend</b> rule SUB-DW-R7 to make subdivision practical following development of MDRH or where it is permitted.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	It is unclear what amendments are sought by the submitter. However I refer to my assessment under submission point S202.14, which recommend amendments to this rule in response to a request by that submitter.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S206	S206.05	Landlink	SUB-DW-R19	Not specified	See submission point S206.07.	<b>Amend</b> rule SUB-DW-R17 to reflect that these considerations may not be appropriate where land is already developed.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	It is unclear what amendments are sought by the submitter. However, I generally consider the operative rule as notified is appropriate. River and stream corridors are the highest risk flood hazard managed under the District Plan, and in my opinion, policy NH-FLOOD-P12 seeks that very careful consideration is given to subdivision and development in relation to these areas (particularly where the land in these areas is already developed). I consider non-complying activity status under SUB-DW-R19 is appropriate for subdivision where the conditions outlined under SUB-DW-R17 are not met.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S206	S206.06	Landlink	SUB-DW-R9	Oppose	A geotech requirement for subdivision where there is established land use. The rule unnecessarily impacts the activity status of subdivisions around developed MDRH where liquefaction has already been managed through the building consent process.	Remove rule SUB-DW-R9 from the District Plan.	4.10.2 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Liquefaction	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.07	Landlink	NH-FLOOD	Not specified	Blanket approach to flood risk and development will be limiting on development due to the extent of parcels with KCDC flood extent within the parcel. The extent of areas affected by flood risk is extensive across the district. With flood risk being a qualifying matter, a considerable number of sites are not able to be developed as a permitted activity in accordance with the MDRS, and therefore the realisable capacity is severely constrained.	Amend subdivision and MDRS requirements in relation to flood risk. Develop an alternative approach - i.e. permitted activity if it can be demonstrated there is no flood risk or that floor level is above the 1% AEP.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Once PC2 becomes operative, it will be a permitted activity to construct up to 3 residential units that comply with the MDRS density standards (under rule GRZ Rx1) on sites within some flood hazard areas, so long as they comply with the permitted activity standards for the relevant flood hazard. This is explained in further detail in section 4.10.1 of the body of the report.  I acknowledge that the extent to which the MDRS have immediate legal effect may have caused confusion on this matter. Currently, because of the requirements of section 86BA of the RMA, the MDRS do not have immediate legal effect in any flood hazard area. However, once PC2 becomes operative, section 86BA ceases to apply, and the provisions associated with the flood hazard overlay will operative on top of the MDRS in the ordinary way.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.08	Landlink	SUB-RES-R26	Not specified	See submission point S206.07.  This allows for the circumstance where a residential unit/s have already been lawfully established and a subdivision is sought at a later date e.g. cross-lease upgrade.	Amend standard 2 under SUB-RES-R26 as follows: <b>2. Each allotment must have a flood free building area above the estimated 1% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event, or have a lawfully/established residential unit on that allotment.</b>	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	SUB-RES-R26 applies to subdivision in the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct only. I consider that the amendment requested is inconsistent with the purpose of the precinct, which seeks to maintain the status quo level of development provided for by the provisions of the operative District Plan within the precinct.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.09	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Not specified	This change is requested with a view to address a disconnect in terms of the effects of subdivision activity status and permitted activities. Retention of minimum lot sizes across most areas for subdivision alongside other standards appears overly restrictive given the potential 'permitted baseline' of land use.	Amend the requirement for 450m2 minimum vacant allotment size in the General Residential Zone, so that the activity does not fall into a non complying activity status if it is not achieved.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the body of the report for details.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-R30. Refer section 10.10 of PC(R1). Amend SUB-RES-R32. Refer section 10.12 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the body of the report for details.
S206	S206.10	Landlink	DO-O3	Not specified	To give effect to the NPS-UD Policy 1 (e), (f) - much greater incentives and support needs to be readily available from central and local government. Currently, DO-O3 (10) is not clearly translated to action elsewhere in PPC2.	Amend PPC2 to focus on incentives and support which would encourage a greater focus on climate change and sustainable development in the region. These focuses could include supports which do not form parts of the district plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought by the submitter, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.  I consider that PC2 provides for DO-O3(10) principally by enabling more efficient use of urban land, and by enabling a greater level of development to occur within walkable catchments of centres and rapid transit stops.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.11	Landlink	Proposed subdivision rules and standards	Not specified	The land use and subdivision rules proposed are not complementary i.e. the subdivision rules appear more prohibitive than land use, when the effects of the built development will already be established. There should not be a disconnect in terms of effects of what is permitted and then later considerations around subdivision.	Amend all proposed subdivision rules and standards so that MDRH when lawfully established will meet all subdivision requirements and rules (or that discretion can be provided around non-compliances) where effects are established.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider the amendments requested to be unclear. The submitter may wish to clarify the amendments sought at the hearing.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.12	Landlink	Districtwide Subdivision rules	Not specified	When subdivision is approved/in the process of being approved where future subdivision is anticipated as a controlled activity around permitted future land use, Council should facilitate that to be installed as part of the initial subdivision. This will make development more feasible and desirable.	Amend districtwide subdivision rules to include broader infrastructure provision as a matter of discretion.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider that the broader provision of infrastructure by the Council (beyond individual subdivision consents) is a matter that is most appropriately addressed through the Council's Long-term Plan, Infrastructure Strategy and Development Contributions Policy, rather than as a matter of discretion under subdivision rules.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.13	Landlink	SUB-DW-Rx1	Not specified	These rules put requirements around stormwater management and infrastructure which could be more restrictive than what has lawfully been established and where potentially the effects have been established prior to subdivision. In cases where the land use is established the effects would have been established under a permitted activity/lawfully established buildings and the submitter considers it unreasonable and impractical to then attempt to manage effects through subdivision controls at a later point in time.	Amend the standards under rule SUB-DW-Rx1 with regard to effects which could already be established through land use and therefore largely negligible and impractical to manage retrospectively through subdivision.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	With regard to the provisions for stormwater systems under standard 1, these apply to new impermeable surfaces, so I do not consider that these can be applied retrospectively.  With regard to the other standards requiring the provision of infrastructure addressed under this rule, these standards require new roads to provide underground services and new allotments to be connected to water supply, wastewater and telecommunications and electricity supply services. It is not clear to me why these should not be complied with, or how existing land use would prevent these standards being met for new allotments.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.14	Landlink	SUB-DW-Rx1	Not specified	If already established impracticable to relocate and negligible in terms of effects.	Amend standard 4 under rule SUB-DW-Rx1 to allow for appropriate easements.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider it unnecessary to amend the standard to provide for easements. If easements are necessary to protect the legal access of reticulated water supply to the boundary, then these should be sought as a matter of course as part of the subdivision.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.15	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	Standard 1b and 2b state subdivision must comply with an approved land use consent, but consent is not sought for a permitted activity.	Amend standard 1b and 2b under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 to not require land use consent to be sought for permitted activities.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider this matter is addressed by standards 1a and 2a. Standards 1b and 2b only apply if standards 1a and 2a are not met.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.16	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	Standard 4 refers to flood free building area. This shouldn't apply if land use is already established (e.g. if new analysis has come in to play since land use established and prior to subdivision).	Amend standard 4 under rule SUB-RES-Rx1 so that this doesn't apply if land use already established.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I consider that it is only necessary that standard 4 apply to vacant allotments. Where allotments are not vacant (because they have already been developed, or have resource consent for the development of new residential units), the provision of a flood free building area is managed under the land use rules for flood hazards in the NH-FLOOD chapter (which generally require the ground floor level of buildings to be constructed above the 1% AEP flood level).	Accept in part.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-Rx1. Refer section 10.6 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for more effective incorporation of the MDRS into the District Plan in relation to an existing qualifying matter, by avoiding reconsideration (under standard 4) of a matter that is already regulated under the land use rules in the NH-FLOOD chapter.
S206	S206.17	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	See submission point S206.13.	Add "the consideration of existing infrastructure associated with existing land use" to matters of control under SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	It is not clear to me exactly what this matter of control is seeking to address. If this is seeking to avoid retrospective upgrades to existing infrastructure connections associated with existing activities, where these do not meet the Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements, then in my opinion this could already be considered (where appropriate to the circumstances) under matter of control 4.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.18	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	If an activity is established as permitted these effects need to be managed through other controls not retrospectively through subdivision.	Remove/amend standard 6 under SUB-RES-Rx1 to remove/amend infrastructure requirements that could retrospectively be trying to manage the effects of established land use.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Standard 6 requires that access, water supply, wastewater and stormwater drainage systems, and underground power and telecommunications must be provided in accordance with the Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements.  I consider it is unlikely that there will be situations where compliance with standard 6 would not be achieved in relation to permitted activities that may be established prior to subdivision, because rule INF-MENU-R27 requires all permitted activities to be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S206	S206.19	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	Given in an extreme scenario you could in principle have 3 x 6 = 18 units with established use prior to subdivision this rule seems arbitrary and should be amended.	Amend standard 7 under SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Standard 7 provides for a maximum of 6 allotments to gain legal and physical access from a right of way.  I consider the amendments requested by the submitter to be unclear. The submitter may wish to clarify the amendments sought at the hearing. I note that I have recommended amendments to this standard in response to submission points S028.46 and S202.10.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.20	Landlink	SUB-RES-Rx1	Not specified	Where permitted land use is possible (particularly MDRH), having strict regard to the rules in the Transport chapter e.g. on site manoeuvring requirements, when use is already established is contrary to the intent of the MDRH rules.	Amend or remove standard 8 under SUB-RES-Rx1.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	I do not consider removal of this standard to be justified, but I note that I have recommended amendments to rule TR-R3 in response to submission point S202.10 that may address the matter raised by the submitter.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.21	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Not specified	The submissions seeks amendment to the minimum lot size requirements for general subdivision where there is no-associated land use given the new 'permitted baseline'.	Amend minimum lot size requirements identified in SUB-RES-Table x1 to align with the new 'permitted baseline'.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	While I consider that the minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor could be reduced to be more consistent with the MDRS, I am mindful that a vacant allotment, once subdivided, will enable the construction of 3 dwellings on that single vacant allotment as a permitted activity (not one). I is not clear to me from the information contained in the submission that a 300m2 minimum allotment area is sufficient to accommodate 3 residential units.  I note that the Ministry for the Environment's Medium Density Residential Standards factsheet (see <a href="https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf">https://environment.govt.nz/assets/uploads/standards_model_factsheet.pdf</a> ) illustrate three potential MDRS development outcomes each based on an approximate 420m2 site area and a minimum site width of 13 metres. On this basis, that reducing the minimum vacant allotment size to 420m2 and shape factor to 13 metres appropriately reflects the level of development sought to be permitted by the MDRS.	Accept.	Yes. Amend SUB-RES-Table x1. Refer to section 10.13 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for a minimum vacant allotment size and shape factor that is more consistent with the level of development anticipated by the MDRS.
S160.FS.2	S206.21.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose primary submission	The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kāpiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.  The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206	S206.22	Landlink	SUB-RES-Table x1	Not specified	Lots of different shapes and sizes will be utilised for infill as they are in other urbanised areas not practical to apply an 18m circle requirement.	Amend SUB-RES-Table x1 to remove diameter circle requirements.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Based on the information contained in the submission I do not consider that it is appropriate to remove the diameter circle requirements for vacant allotment subdivision. However I note that I have recommended a reduction in size of the minimum shape factor for vacant allotments in response to submission points S028.52, S122.80, S153.13, and S202.05.	Do not accept.	No.
S160.FS.2	S206.22.FS01	Gomez, Nancy	SUB-RES-Table x1	Oppose primary submission	The submitter considers that reducing lot sizes and allowing pedestrian access instead of drive-on access would be out of character with existing developed lots, and detracts from the space and quality of living that Kāpiti residents in suburban areas are seeking.  The submitter also notes that: - A reduction in lot sizes could be considered, but not to the extent proposed in the primary submission. The submitter considers that no less than 350m2 size and 14m shape factor would be appropriate. - Breaching controlled activity status should continue to be a non-complying activity; - Incorporating pedestrian access as an alternative to vehicle access can result in construction vehicle and repair/maintenance issues due to the narrow access for rear lots and buildings. - The removal of rainwater tanks should not be considered. Given the capacity of the stormwater networks, significant reduction of soakage area per lot and climate change, the installation of rainwater tanks is needed to mitigate the increased stormwater runoff and flooding.	Disallow primary submission.	4.7 MDRS & NPS-UD - Subdivision	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S206	S206.23	Landlink	FC-R5	Not specified	FC-R5 is not feasible in relation to all developments, particularly larger scale developments, to request the payment of all contributions prior to s224 Certificates - this is because often developers may seek to complete the sale of lots to facilitate payment of the development contributions.	Amend so that financial contributions can be paid after s224 particularly for larger developments.	4.17 Financial Contributions	I consider it reasonable that financial contributions are required to be paid prior to the release of a certificate under section 224(c) of the RMA, and I note that this is consistent with the timing for the payment of development contributions under the Council's Development Contributions Policy (refer clauses 151 and 152 of the Development Contributions Policy).	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.24	Landlink	FC-R7	Not specified	No specific reasons given.	Amend standard 2 under rule FC-R7 to note "unless impeded by the Council".	4.17 Financial Contributions	I consider the purpose of the additional wording requested by the submitter to be unclear.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.25	Landlink	Design Guides	Not specified	The submitter seeks clarification around how Council will assess the assessments against design guides and in what circumstances they will request peer reviews of assessments - i.e. as a direct requirement will Council have in house capability to assess or will further financial cost be passed to the applicant.	Clarify Design Guide assessment requirements.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	In my opinion, how the Council assesses development proposals (and whether or not experts and/or peer review is required to assist with this) is a matter that is most appropriately addressed through the resource consent process for specific development proposals. I consider that it would not be efficient or effective to prescribe this through the District Plan, as this could risk over or under prescribing the level of assessment required in the circumstances of individual development proposals.	Do not accept.	No.
S206	S206.26	Landlink	UFD-P1	Not specified	Policy UFD-P1 is in conflict with what is enabled through MDRH (i.e. development aligning with planned infrastructure).	Amend policy UFD-P1.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	It is not clear to me what amendments are sought by the submitter, and they may wish to clarify this at the hearing.  I do not consider UFD-P1 to be inconsistent with the MDRS, but I note that I have recommended a range of amendments to the policy in response to other submissions.	Do not accept.	No.
S207	S207.01	Metlifecare Limited	DO-Ox3	Support	Metlifecare supports the provision of residential intensification precincts which provide for increased building height and density within parts of the General Residential Zone that are located within the areas to which policy 3 of the NPS-UD applies.	Retain DO-Ox3 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S207	S207.02	Metlifecare Limited	DO-O11	Support	Metlifecare supports the amendment to DO-O11 to recognise that character and amenity values change over time.	Retain DO-O11 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept in part. Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S207	S207.03	Metlifecare Limited	UFD-Px	Support in part	Metlifecare generally supports this new strategic direction. However: • The purpose of this strategic direction is to clarify where development is enabled. It should be made clear that development should be enabled on larger sites because they provide intensification opportunities and provide for more efficient use of those sites. • the comments made about the nature of qualifying matter areas does not align with the Amendment Act and are otherwise not appropriate. Qualifying matter areas are used to identify areas where a specified territorial authority may make the MDRS and relevant building height or density requirements less enabling to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter. They are not necessarily applied to areas where development should be avoided.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-Px as follows: Provide for heights and densities of urban built form that enable more people to live in, and more businesses and community services to be located in, the District's urban environments, by: 1. enabling the greatest building heights and densities in the Metropolitan Centre Zone, including buildings up to 12-stories; 2. enabling greater building heights and densities within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone and the train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae, including buildings up to 6-stories; 3. enabling greater building heights and densities in the Town Centre Zone, including buildings up to 6-stories; 4. enabling increased building heights and densities in the Local Centre Zone, including buildings up to 4-stories; 5. enabling increased building heights and densities adjacent to the Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone, including buildings up to 4-stories; and 6. enabling a variety of building heights and densities in the General Residential Zone, including buildings up to 3-stories; 7. enabling more intensive development on larger sites to provide for the efficient use of those sites. while recognising it may be appropriate to be less enabling of development to accommodate an identified avoiding inappropriate buildings, activities, heights and densities within qualifying matter areas.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	In relation to clause 7, I do not consider it necessary to include a policy to provide for the efficient use of larger sites, for the reasons stated in my response to submission point S197.39.  However, I agree with the submitter in relation to the final sentence of the policy. As worded, this could be interpreted as creating an avoid policy for development within what have been identified as <i>qualifying matter areas</i> . I agree with the submitter that this would be inconsistent with the approach to qualifying matters outlined under both the RMA and NPS-UD. Further, the wording proposed by PC2 could be seen to override existing policies related to development within qualifying matter areas. I consider it appropriate that existing policies in the District Plan related to qualifying matters are applied to the circumstances of the case, without the additional overarching "avoid" policy in UFD-P1 (which may not be justified in all circumstances).  The amendment requested by the submitter provides a sufficient prompt for plan users to be aware that increased levels of development are not necessarily enabled in relation to areas where qualifying matters apply (in which case the policies related to those qualifying matters should direct the appropriate level of development to be enabled). I therefore consider the wording proposed by the submitter in relation to the last sentence of the policy to be more appropriate than the wording proposed by PC2.  In order to maintain the link between the policy and the list of qualifying matters identified in the District Plan outlined under the definition of <i>qualifying matter area</i> , I consider a consequential amendment to the definition is required to rename the definition as <i>identified qualifying matter</i> .	<b>Accept in part.</b> Reject the request to insert a new clause 7. Accept the amended wording to the final sentence of the policy. Consequentially amend the definition of <i>qualifying matter area</i> to rename the definition as <i>identified qualifying matter</i> .	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-Px. Refer section 2.1 of PC(R1). Amend the definition of QUALIFYING MATTER AREA. Refer to section 20.11 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it provides for greater consistency with the approach to qualifying matters provided for by the MDRS and the NPS-UD. I also consider that it provides for clearer interpretation of existing District Plan policies related to qualifying matters.
S207	S207.04	Metlifecare Limited	UFD-P2	Support	Amendments are proposed to be made to clarify that the intention is to encourage high amenity values rather than maintain high amenity values. Metlifecare supports this amendment as it is consistent with policy 6(b) of the NPS UD.	<b>Retain</b> UFD-P2 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.05	Metlifecare Limited	UFD-P3	Support	Metlifecare supports the amendments made to this provision as it provides flexibility for character and amenity values to be considered, where provided for in the District Plan. However, to be consistent and give effect to this, further amendments are required to policies relating to amenity in the General Residential zone provisions (explained below).	<b>Retain</b> UFD-P4 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	On the basis that the submitter seeks amendments to UFD-P4 under submission point S207.05, I consider that the decision requested should refer to UFD-P3.  Support is noted.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting I have recommended amendments to this provision in response to other submissions.	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.06	Metlifecare Limited	UFD-P4	Oppose	The detail provided in UFD-P4 unnecessarily restricts future development in Kapiti by potentially limiting areas identified for higher density development.  Metlifecare seeks that the strategic direction be broad and that the particular details (including defined areas of growth) are applied through relevant zone provisions in the District Plan.	<b>Amend</b> UFD-P4 as shown in red below: The density of subdivision and development will be managed through an area-specific provisions approach to achieve an appropriate range of housing types, density and form across the District, as set out below: 1. the highest densities, including apartments as part of mixed-use developments, will be located within and in immediate proximity to centres; 2. medium density housing will be limited to specific precinct areas within walking distance of centres higher density development, including multi-storey apartments, will be provided for within a walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone, train stations at Paekākāriki, Paraparaumu and Waikanae, and adjacent to the Town Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone; 3. focused infill will be encouraged in specific areas where there is good access to shops and services a variety of densities will be provided for in the General Residential Zone; 4. within the Neighbourhood Development Areas identified in the Ngāraa Development Area Structure Plan in Appendix 7, the provision of affordable housing will be encouraged at appropriate locations with good access to shops and services; and 5. traditional low density residential subdivision will be allowed within the general residential area; 6. overall existing low densities will be maintained in special character areas identified in GRZP3; 7. especially low densities will be applied in Low Density Housing Precinct areas (identified on the District Plan Maps) as transitions between rural and urban environments; and 8. in areas where infrastructure constraints exist (such as water, wastewater or roading), densities will reflect those constraints residential densities will reflect be integrated with existing or planned infrastructure capacity.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	While I consider that this policy is consistent with the increased levels of development sought by Policy 3 of the NPS-UD, I also consider that the detailed matters outlined under this policy are already provided for under policy UFD-Px, policies associated with each zone or development area, and policies in the Infrastructure chapter of the District Plan. I therefore consider that the policy contains unnecessary duplication of detail, and on this basis I consider it would improve interpretation of the District Plan to amend the policy to be strategic and broad as requested by the submitter.  I recommend a minor amendment to include the word "built" before "form", as I consider that this would provide for clearer interpretation of the policy (and greater consistency with the policies of the NPS-UD, which use the term "built form").	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting a minor amendment to the wording requested by the submitter to include the word "built" before "form".	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P4. Refer section 2.5 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves interpretation of the District Plan by avoiding unnecessary duplication of policy detail that is otherwise provided for in appropriate locations across the District Plan.
S207	S207.07	Metlifecare Limited	UFD-Px	Support	The Strategic Direction Chapter does not explicitly recognise the crucial role that retirement and aged care facilities have in providing for the health and wellbeing of the New Zealand community and the provision of housing for elderly residents.  This fails to recognise that the local community benefits from the provision of retirement villages. For example, they release pressure on social and health services and contribute to employment opportunities, both in the construction sector and day-to-day operations. They also allow residents to live in familiar suburbs where they often have family and friends in close proximity. Further, Retirement Villages have a crucial role in the general housing market because the supply of retirement village housing releases existing housing stock into the market and reduces pressure on existing infrastructure.  Metlifecare seeks that a new strategic policy is incorporated as UDF-PX to recognise the growing role that retirement villages will have in providing healthy, safe, affordable homes that meet the needs of older people in the community and to meet demand for this type of housing. This should then filter down into other objectives and policies in the Proposed Plan.	<b>Add</b> the following to UFD-Px (or words to similar effect): The housing and care needs of the ageing population are recognised and provided for across the District to meet demand.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the S42A report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend UFD-P2. Refer section 2.3 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the S42A report.
S207	S207.08	Metlifecare Limited	Introductory text to the General Residential Zone chapter	Oppose in part	The Amendment Act recognises the need for a range of different housing typologies to meet the day to day needs of the population. In Metlifecare's view, the introduction should not list a fulsome range of housing types but not all potential housing types.	<b>Amend</b> the introduction as follows (or words to similar effect): A mix of housing densities are provided for throughout the Zone, with higher densities enabled in areas that are well served by public transport or are close to a range of commercial activities and community services. Housing types anticipated in the Zone include detached housing, semi-detached housing, terrace housing, low-rise apartments, retirement villages and in some areas mid-rise apartments. The development of papakāinga is also provided for within the Zone. The Zone does not promote one form of housing over another but instead provides flexibility to meet the community's diverse housing needs and should reflect the demand for certain types of housing, including retirement villages which provide a range of facilities, housing options, activities, and social and health benefits to suit the needs of older people in the community.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S207	S207.09	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Px1, GRZ-Px2, GRZ-Px3, GRZ-Px4, GRZ-Px5	Support	Metlifecare supports these policies on the basis they are consistent with the Amendment Act.	Retain as notified.	4.4.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - MDRS Objectives and Policies	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	No.
S207	S207.10	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Px6	Oppose in part	As further explained below, the matters contained in a Residential Design Guide do not make reference to all types of residential development. It makes no specific reference to retirement villages and fails to recognise or provide for the differing functional and operational needs of retirement villages.  The design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a matter to be addressed in a policy but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only.	Amend GRZ-Px6 with the amendments shown in red: <u>Provide for higher-density housing within Residential Intensification Precincts, including:</u> <u>1. within Residential Intensification Precinct A, residential buildings up to 6-storeys; and</u> <u>2. within Residential Intensification Precinct B, residential buildings up to 4-storeys;</u> <u>where development meets the requirements of the Residential Design Guide in Appendix x1.</u>	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S207	S207.11	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-P1	Support	Metlifecare supports deleting existing policy GRZ-P1 on the basis it is inconsistent with the Amendment Act.	Delete GRZ-P1 as notified.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	Accept.	No.
S207	S207.12	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-P9	Oppose in part	Seeking to limit the number of residential units per allotment is not consistent with the purpose or provisions of the Amendment Act.  The functional and operational requirements of different housing typologies enabled by the Amendment Act also need to be recognised. There is opportunity to do that by amending this policy.  It is also considered that a 'limited number of accessory buildings' is unduly restrictive when it applies to the broad range of residential activities, including retirement villages which can have a number of accessory and ancillary buildings for the use and enjoyment of residents. It is considered that the policy wording can be enabling and the rules provide appropriate restrictions based on the specific type of use.  Metlifecare otherwise supports the amendments proposed to this policy.	Amend GRZ-P9 as shown in red (or words to similar effect): Residential activities will be recognised and provided for as the principal use in the Residential Zones, while ensuring that the effects of subdivision, use and development is in accordance with the following principles: 1. adverse effects on natural systems will be avoided, remedied or mitigated; 2. new built development will relate to local built identity, character values and the density of the surrounding residential environment be compatible with the planned built character of the Zone; 3. transport choice and efficiency will be maximised; 4. housing types which meet the need of households will be provided for; 5. the functional and operational requirements of different types of housing solutions are recognised; and 6. a limited number of accessory buildings and buildings which are ancillary to residential activities will be provided for.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept.	Yes. Amend GRZ-P9. Refer section 4.13 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report.
S207	S207.13	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-P10	Oppose	As noted above, Strategic Direction UFD-P2 – Housing Choice seeks to encourage high amenity, not achieve high amenity.  In addition, the provision as drafted has not been sufficiently updated to recognise the Density Standards in the MDRS. Instead, it imposes additional considerations which are not consistent with the Amendment Act and do not give effect to the NPS UD.	Amend GRZ-P10 as shown in red below (or words to similar effect): Subdivision, use and development in the Residential Zones will be required to achieve a high-level of on-site amenity for residents and neighbours in accordance with the following principles: 1. building size and footprint will be proportional to the size of the allotment; 2. usable and easily accessible private outdoor living spaces will be provided; 3. buildings and structures will be designed and located to maximise sunlight access, privacy and amenity for the site and adjoining allotments; 4. buildings and structures will be designed and located to minimise visual impact and to ensure they are of a scale which is consistent with the area's urban form compatible with the planned built character of the Zone; 5. appropriate separation distances will be maintained between buildings; 6. yards will be provided to achieve appropriate building setbacks from neighbouring areas, the street and the coast; 7. hard and impermeable surfaces will be offset by permeable areas on individual allotments; 8. unreasonable and excessive noise, odour, smoke, dust, light, glare and vibration will be avoided; 9. non-residential buildings will be of a form and scale which is compatible with the surrounding residential environment; and 10. service areas for non-residential activities will be screened, and planting and landscaping will be provided.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I agree with the submitter that the policy should be consistent with UFD-P2, and consider that the amendments requested to the wording of the first sentence achieve this.  In relation to clauses 1 and 5, I disagree that these are not consistent with the MDRS. The building coverage MDRS standard provides for building size and footprint to be proportional to the area of the allotment. I also consider that the height in relation to boundary, setback and outlook space MDRS standards relate to the consideration of appropriate separation distances between buildings. I therefore consider that principles 1 and 5 continue to be relevant, particularly in circumstances where the MDRS density standards are breached, and consideration needs to be given to these matters as part of a resource consent application.	Accept in part. Accept the amendment requested to the first sentence of the policy. Reject the request to delete clauses 1 and 5 of the policy.	Yes. Amend GRZ-P10. Refer to section 4.14 of PC(R1).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> I consider this amendment is a more appropriate way to achieve the objectives of PC2 and the purpose of the RMA, because it improves interpretation of the policy by ensuring that it is consistent with policy UFD-P2. I also consider that the amendment is more consistent with MDRS policy 5, which seeks to encourage high quality development.
S207	S207.14	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-P12	Oppose	This policy indicates that landscaping is required for residential development to enhance residential amenity and sets out a set of principles regulating the location and design of landscaping.  The detail of the policy is also better provided for in the rules.  This policy is inconsistent with the landscaping standard in the Amendment Act.	Delete GRZ-P12 or amend it as shown in red below (or words to similar effect): Landscaping will be required for non-residential activities and intensive residential development in the Residential Zones to maintain and enhance the built environment residential amenity, while promoting water conservation and biodiversity and allowing for the natural infiltration of surface waters through permeable treatments. Landscaping will be located and designed in accordance with the following principles: 1. the visual impact of large buildings will be reduced by appropriate screening and planting; 2. service areas, loading areas and outdoor storage areas will be screened; 3. on-site outdoor living spaces will be defined and enhanced by landscaping; 4. sunlight access and passive surveillance to adjoining areas will not be unreasonably restricted; 5. public infrastructure and services will not be damaged or blocked; 6. planting of locally indigenous vegetation will be encouraged; and 7. permeable surfaces will be provided for the natural infiltration of surface waters.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I do not consider the matters outlined in the policy to be inconsistent with the MDRS. The MDRS require at least 20% of the site area to be set aside for landscaping, and I consider the principles outlined in the policy to be relevant to the assessment of resource consent applications where the landscape area standard is not met.	Do not accept.	No.
S207	S207.15	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-P16	Oppose	Metlifecare seeks amendments to GRZ-P16 to be consistent with the Amendment Act and give effect to the NPS UD. For example, GRZ-P16 applies a number of principles that will constrain development which is not in keeping with the changes required in the Amendment Act and NPS UD. It is important that this policy recognises and provides for diverse housing needs.  In addition, the Plan provides for a definition of retirement village but this is not used in this policy. Supported living accommodation and retirement villages have different functional and operational needs, and it is appropriate that they have different rules applying to them. This policy should be clear that they are different activities, consistent with the changes sought below to provide separate rules for retirement villages.	Amend GRZ-P16 as shown in red below (or words to similar effect): The development of supported living accommodation and retirement villages will be provided for in a range of forms, including units, minor residential units, complexes, and shared accommodation, rest homes and retirement accommodation, where it is located within the Residential Zones and integrated with the surrounding environment. Supported living accommodation includes accommodation specifically designed for older persons. Supported living accommodation will be undertaken in accordance with the following principles: 1. on-site pedestrian movement and use of open space by residents will not be unduly restricted by the slope of the land; 2. design and development to promote interaction with surrounding communities, without compromising privacy and safety; 3. the scale and design of development will reflect the residential nature and character of the location, and ensure access through the subject site by the public and residents, including the provision of public legal roads and pedestrian accessways consistent with residential scale blocks; and 4. where practicable, the development will be located within walking distance of essential facilities such as local shops, health and community services and public transport networks.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S207	S207.16	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-R4	Oppose	The Plan provides that share and group accommodation and supporting living accommodation (which is defined as accommodation where live-in health or pastoral care/support) is a permitted activity provided that there are no more than 6 residents accommodated at any time and no more than one residential unit is provided. It also requires that any building used for these purposes must comply with the standards in GRZ-R6 excluding Rx1, x2 or x3.  This restrictive rule is not appropriate to apply to retirement villages which will typically provide for more than 6 residents.  Activities which do not comply are discretionary activities under the Plan, under rule GRZ-R19.  It is appropriate that retirement village use is separately provided for and enabled.	Provide a <b>new rule</b> for retirement villages as a permitted activity without any standards applying.  We also note that the reference in GRZ-R4(3) to "GRZ-R6" needs to be <b>updated</b> to reference "GRZ-RX1".	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.  Additionally, I disagree that the reference in GRZ-R4(3) needs to be updated as requested by the submitter. GRZ-R6 remains valid for development within the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and PC(N) includes an update to reference GRZ-Rx1 in addition to GRZ-R6.	Do not accept.	No.
S053.FS.1	S207.16.FS01	Waka Kotahi	GRZ-R4	Oppose primary submission	Retirement villages have effects to the wider environment that need to be considered – such as effects to the transport network from traffic generation. The plan provides for retirement activities as a permitted activity – to a limited scale.	Disallow primary submission point.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S207	S207.17	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Rx1	Multiple positions	The construction of retirement village buildings or any additions or alterations in the General Residential zone or in a Residential Intensification Precinct will be a restricted discretionary activity as the relevant standards will be infringed.  It is onerous for any additions or alterations to existing retirement villages to be a restricted discretionary activity. There should be a new rule for additions and alterations to retirement villages to be permitted subject to compliance with appropriate standards.  Metlifecare supports new retirement villages being considered as restricted discretionary activities, however this activity also needs to be provided as a separate rule because: (a) A number of the standards do not apply to retirement village developments e.g. outlook space per unit. (b) Matters of discretion that are proposed to apply in Rx5 include consideration of the Residential Design Guide and Council's Land Development Minimum Requirements (design and construction requirements). These documents do not discuss retirement villages, particular design intentions in relation to these villages, or take into account their functional and operational needs. It is therefore difficult to determine how these can be applied or how the criteria could be satisfied. It is not appropriate for retirement village developments to be required to align with design goals that apply to residential development more generally because it fails to recognise the differing functional and operational needs of retirement villages. (c) Residential development (broadly defined) was sought to be enabled under the Amendment Act. However, the approach taken, prevents that from happening in relation to retirement villages.  Metlifecare therefore seeks that new rules are added which provide for additions and alterations to existing retirement villages as permitted (subject to standards), and the construction of new retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity.  The standard relating to landscaping is also unclear in terms of its application where there are a number of units, and also it should not only apply where there are ground floor units. The standard should just apply on a site basis, and be clear that the landscaped area does not need to be associated with each unit.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx1 to provide that the following are excluded from this rule: <b>Buildings and structures for a retirement village.</b>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S207	S207.18	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Rx1	Multiple positions	See submission point S207.17.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx1 Standards Landscaped Area to read as follows (or words to similar effect): <b>10. A residential unit at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site must be landscaped with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them.</b> <b>11. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit.</b>	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The wording used in standard 10 under rule GRZ-Rx1 is the same as that used in clause 18 of Schedule 3A to the RMA, which is required to be incorporated into the District Plan. I consider that the amendment sought would be inconsistent with this requirement.	Do not accept.	No.
S207	S207.19	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Rx1	Multiple positions	See submission point S207.17.	<b>Add</b> a rule for "Any minor works, additions or alterations to any retirement village within the General Residential Zone" as a permitted activity subject to compliance with: <b>GRZ-Rx1 Standards 2 (height), 3 (height to boundary), 4 (setbacks), 5 (building coverage), and 10 and 11 (landscaping).</b>  <b>Add</b> a rule for "Any minor works, additions or alterations to any retirement village within the Residential Intensification Precinct" as a permitted activity subject to compliance with: <b>GRZ-Rx1 Standards 4 (setbacks), 5 (building coverage), and 10 and 12 (landscaping); and GRZ-Rx2 Standards 2 (Height – 20m for Precinct A and 14m for Precinct B).</b>  When compliance with these standards is not achieved any minor works, additions or alterations to any retirement village will require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion will be limited to the extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the standards listed above.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Accept in part. Refer to the S42A report for details.	Yes. Amend GRZ-Rx1. Refer section 4.18 of PC(R1).  Section 32AA evaluation Refer to the S42A report.
S207	S207.20	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Rx1	Multiple positions	See submission point S207.17.	<b>Add</b> a new rule for "New retirement village buildings within the General Residential Zone" as a restricted discretionary activity. Provide that the matters of discretion are restricted to: <b>1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard:</b> <b>a. GRZ-Px1 – PX5</b> <b>b. GRZ-Px2</b> <b>c. GRZ-P9 (Residential Activities)</b> <b>d. GRZ-P16 (Supporting Living and Older Persons Accommodation)</b> <b>2. The matters in GRZ-Rx1.2 (height), 1.3 (HIRB), 1.4 (setbacks), 1.5 (building coverage), and 1.10 and 1.11 (landscaping).</b> <b>3. The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</b>	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S207	S207.21	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Rx2	Multiple positions	See submission point S207.17.	<b>Provide</b> for "New retirement village buildings within the Residential Intensification Precinct" as a restricted discretionary activity. Provide that the matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringing standard: a. GRZ-Px1 – PX5 b. GRX-Px2 c. GRZ-P9 (Residential Activities) d. GRZ-P16 (Supporting Living and Older Persons Accommodation) 2. The matters in GRZ-Rx1 1.4 (setbacks), 1.5 (building coverage), 1.10 and 1.11 (landscaping), and GRZ-Rx2.2 (height), 3. The functional and operational needs of retirement villages.  <b>Retain</b> permitted activity standard Height 2(a) as notified to provide for 20m in height for Residential Intensification Precinct A.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.22	Metlifecare Limited	GRZ-Rx5, GRZ-Rx6	Oppose	See submission point S207.17.	<b>Amend</b> GRZ-Rx5 and GRZ-Rx6 to provide that the following are excluded from this rule: - Buildings and structures for a retirement village.	4.6.2 MDRS & NPS-UD - Additional Activities - Retirement Villages	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.23	Metlifecare Limited	Paraparumu Planning Maps	Support	Metlifecare supports the application of the General Residential provisions (which include the MDRS) to the site at 1 Henley Way, as they include the minimum requirements in the Amendment Act.	Provided that Metlifecare's relief above is provided, no further relief is sought.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Support is noted.	<b>No recommendation.</b> No decision requested.	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.24	Metlifecare Limited	Paraparumu Planning Maps	Support	Part of the site adjacent to 56 Te Roto Drive is located within the General Residential zone and part of the site is located in the General Industrial zone.  For the purpose of giving effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD and creating a contiguous zoning pattern with the adjacent land, Metlifecare supports part of the site being located in the General Residential zone.	<b>Ensure</b> part of the site adjacent to 56 Te Roto Drive remains located within the General Residential zone.  Refer to the maps included in page 7 of the original submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that the site is zoned General Residential in the operative District Plan, and PC2 does not propose to amend this.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.25	Metlifecare Limited	Paraparumu Planning Maps	Support	Metlifecare supports the application of the Residential Intensification Precinct A provisions to the site at Coastal Villa Spencer Russell Drive, Paraparumu.	<b>Retain</b> the residential intensification precinct provisions in relation to the Metlifecare Coastal Villa site, subject to the amendments proposed above.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Retaining this site within Residential Intensification Precinct A is consistent with giving effect to Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.26	Metlifecare Limited	NH-FLOOD-R3, NH-FLOOD-R8, NH-FLOOD-R11	Support	Metlifecare supports the consideration of flood risks as a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity. This recognises that additional considerations must be taken into account, but does not unnecessarily limit the development potential of sites in the district because of this "qualifying matter".	<b>Retain</b> NH-FLOOD-R8 and NH-FLOOD-R11 as notified.	4.10.1 Qualifying Matters - General Matters - Flood Hazard	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S207	S207.27	Metlifecare Limited	APPx1 - Residential Design Guide	Oppose	As explained above, the Guide does not discuss retirement villages, particular design intentions in relation to these villages, or take into account their functional and operational needs.  It is not appropriate for retirement village developments to be required to align with design goals that apply to residential development more generally as described in the Guide.	<b>Amend</b> the Residential Design Guide to make it clear that it does not apply to retirement village development.  <b>Provide</b> for the Residential Design Guide as a guidance tool only that sits outside of the Plans.	4.8 MDRS & NPS-UD - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S100.FS.1	S207.FS01	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Full submission	Support primary submission	Ātiawa supports the provision of housing and care facilities within retirement villages. We recognise the unique nature of those facilities and the role they play in communities. We also recognise that they form part of the community and, as with other activities they have effects that need to be assessed and avoided, remedies or mitigated. Ātiawa therefore oppose the proposal to exempt retirement villages from design criteria, enable increased densities and preclude notification. Recognise, within PC2, the role of retirement villages within our communities and provide design criteria or require structure plans relevant to the activity.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S208	S208.01	Landlink (and TBC)	Te Moana Interchange Cluster, Waikanae	Not specified	The submission relates to the rezoning of land parcels around the Te Moana Road interchange.  The submission seeks rezoning of the site for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - The site is in a prime location to facilitate future residential development; - The current zoning no longer seems appropriate given the limited productive yield of the land, surrounding urbanisation, surrounding ecological features and the presence of potential natural wetlands. - Development on site can be facilitated through existing infrastructure. - The site is accessible from Te Moana road. - The site has a number of flood hazards. These would be managed through any subsequent development. - The site is situated centrally within established and increasingly urbanised areas. - The existing rural lots are fragmented with numerous smaller lots and subdivisions taking place in the surrounds over the last couple of decades. - Further analysis into the management of constraints would easily demonstrate was in which concerns around development could be overcome. - Development of the site would provide a notable contribution to housing supply. - Rezoning of the site has the potential to give effect to the NPS-UD.  The submission advocates that PC2 further investigates and subsequently includes the sites as residential through PC2. The submission notes the importance of engagement with iwi and mana whenua as part of this process, which is why further investigation is also advocated.	<b>Rezone</b> the sites located to the west and east of the Te Moana interchange (identified in figure 1 of the submission) from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Submission deemed to be out of scope. Refer to section 4.14 of the body of the report for details.	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>	<b>Submission deemed to be out of scope.</b>
S054.FS.1	S208.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Te Moana Interchange Cluster, Waikanae	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.
S100.FS.1	S208.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	Te Moana Interchange Cluster, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	The sites referenced in S209.01 and west S208.01 sit in the Takamore urupā and waahi tapu precinct. Rezoning these areas for residential development is therefore inappropriate and strongly opposed by Ātiawa  The east side of the site referenced in S208.01 and S189.01 sit in the Tukurākau Heritage site. Any future proposals for the Takamore and Tukurākau precincts would require in depth assessment with mana whenua given their history.  Retain existing zoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.	Primary submission is out of scope.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S209	S209.01	Osborne, Vince and Eric	100 & 110 Te Moana Road, Waikanae	Not specified	The submission relates to the exclusion 100 and 110 Te Moana Road, Waikanae from rezoning as part of PC2.  The submission seeks rezoning of the site for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Given the increasing urbanisation and development surrounding the site, it is an ideal candidate for short term development. - It is likely there is network capacity and telecommunications which would be available to service proposed residential development. - The site is subject to minor localised surface water and a water body (which is protected by a QEII covenant). Feasible development can be undertaken protecting the values of the wetland. - Access would be anticipated from Te Moana Road. - The site is located adjacent to a local centre zone (the Ngarara Zone). Rezoning of the area is directed by policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD. - Constraints associated with the Expressway, flooding and waterbodies, ecological sites, wetlands, and the adjacent wāhi tapu site can be 3feasibly managed. - The site does not require a structure plan approach. - Development would provide a notable contribution to housing supply, with a strong potential to be realised. - Rezoning of the site has the potential to give effect to the NPS-UD.	<b>Rezone</b> 100 and 110 Te Moana Road (Lot 1 DP 71916 and Part Lot 2 DP 71916) from General Rural Zone to General Residential Zone.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Refer to body of report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S053.FS.1	S209.01.FS01	Waka Kotahi	100 & 110 Te Moana Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	The greenfield development proposed is located away from existing centre zones, employment opportunities and accessibility to public and active transport modes meaning that the development of this area has the potential to result in an isolated, low density urban settlement.  Further site-specific evidence and information is required to understand the need to rezone greenfield land.	Disallow primary submission. Waka Kotahi request further site-specific assessments to justify the need for additional greenfield zoned land in this location (after the additional capacity provided by the intensification provisions), assess accessibility to active and public transport, hazards, infrastructure requirements (including stormwater) and any reverse sensitivity issue.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S100.FS.1	S209.01.FS02	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai	100 & 110 Te Moana Road, Waikanae	Oppose primary submission	The sites referenced in S209.01 and west S208.01 sit in the Takamore urupā and waahi tapu precinct. Rezoning these areas for residential development is therefore inappropriate and strongly opposed by Ātiawa Any future proposals for the Takamore and Tukurākau precincts would require in depth assessment with mana whenua given their history. Retain existing zoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.16 Rezoning - Other Rezoning Requests	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.01	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Multiple positions	The submission presents the main areas of importance for the three mana whenua iwi, A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira) in the Kāpiti area.  The submission refers to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for the detail about decisions sought on Plan Change 2.  The submission presents the following matters being of importance to all three iwi: 1. Meaningful engagement and timing (related to the preparation of Plan Change 2). 2. Infrastructure planning and provision. 3. Papakāinga. 4. Sites and areas of significance to Māori, including the Marae Takiwā precinct, Kārewarewa Urupā, and Schedule 9 of the District Plan. 5. Proposed amendments to the District Objectives to give effect to the MDRS and NPS-UD. 6. Proposed amendments to the General Residential Zone (including the application of design guides, and the potential establishment of a design panel). 7. The proposed application of Residential Intensification Precincts. 8. Proposed amendments to Financial Contributions provisions.	Refer to the decisions requested by Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203).	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Refer to recommendations on the decisions requested by Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203).	Refer to recommendations on the decisions requested by Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203).	Refer to recommendations on the decisions requested by Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203).
S104.Fs.1	S210.01.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	General	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.02	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Not specified	The submission states that as a result of the implementation requirements of the NPS-UD and the direction given by the Government, mana whenua were provided inadequate opportunities and insufficient time to consider and contribute to the development of these proposals. This is considered an RMA engagement breach and is far from the Tiriti House Model.	<b>Request</b> more meaningful engagement on a number of the decisions and aspects of the plan.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	As outlined in the body of the report, I acknowledge that the constraints imposed on the Council and iwi by the legislation has led to a situation where iwi consider they have been unable to meaningfully participate in several aspects of the plan change.  As outlined in the body of the report, the Council is separately preparing several changes to the District Plan (including a plan change focussed on matters related to mana whenua), and I consider that my recommendations in relation to PC2 do not (and should not be seen to) preclude engagement on these matters through these other plan changes.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on these matters outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.03	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Not specified	The submission identifies that mana whenua seek growth that that retains the ability for their people to live in their own rohe, and creates housing opportunities that attract their people home as part of the growing population. Housing should be supported by life sustaining infrastructure including public transport hubs.	<b>Provide for</b> the Tino Rangatiratanga of hapū and iwi in relation to their land and waterways by policies and rules that enable hapū and iwi to manage sustainable use of these taonga.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that in relation to PC2, the outcome sought by the submitter is addressed in part through the papakāinga provisions. I also consider that my recommendations to amend PC2 to provide for papakāinga development in the Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre and Mixed Use Zones would support achieving the outcome sought by the submitter.  In relation to infrastructure, I refer to my assessment and recommendations on tangata whenua submission points related to the planning for and provision of infrastructure under section 4.2.5 of the body of the report.  Notwithstanding this, as noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to continue to work together on these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to recommendations made in relation to the papakāinga provisions.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer to recommendations made in relation to the papakāinga provisions.
S097.FS.1	S210.03.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General	Support primary submission	A.R.T identifies that mana whenua seek growth that retains their ability for people to live in their own rohe and creates housing to attract people home. A.R.T seek policies and rules that provide for Tino Rangatiratanga in relation to land and water. Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks enable tangata whenua to exercise their tino rangatiratanga to provide for the ongoing relationship od mana whenua with their ancestral lands. Greater Wellington support A.R.T's submission seeking additional provisions to achieve this.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S210.03.FS02	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S210	S210.04	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Not specified	The submission states that he manaakitanga that iwi, hapū and ahi kā have provided over generations to share their home with Tangata Tiriti needs to be recognised in the way growth is managed. This includes recognising the significant role of Marae as a spiritual and cultural home for tangata whenua, a social hub and in civil emergencies.	<b>Require</b> proactive initiatives to ensure that (tangata whenua) history, identity and culture is respected and given expression in the District Plan.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that PC(N) includes several provisions that respond to the matters raised by the submitters, including the papakāinga provisions and the Marae Takiwā Precinct. I note that I have made several recommendations to amend the papakāinga provisions in response to matters raised by submitters.  Notwithstanding this, as noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to continue to work together on these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to recommendations made in relation to the papakāinga provisions.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer to recommendations made in relation to the papakāinga provisions.
S210	S210.05	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General - Infrastructure	Not specified	The submission states that, if done poorly, housing and intensification can have enduring negative impacts on the relationship of iwi with their lands and waters. The submission notes that it is critical that the provision of infrastructure is proactively managed to support development, in conjunction with or in advance of housing development.  The submission states that there is insufficient evidence to support the statement that there is adequate infrastructure to support the growth that Ngāti will need for the level of intensification that is proposed. The submitter is aware from their interactions with utility providers that there are serious three waters infrastructure issues at present.	<b>Take extra time and steps</b> to ensure we 'grow well' to achieve well-functioning urban and rural environments in accordance with tikanga Māori that will enable people and the environment to flourish together.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I acknowledge the matters raised by the submitters. While PC2 is subject to the statutory timeframes required by the ISPP. As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to continue to work together on these matters as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.  In relation to the planning for and provision of infrastructure, I refer to my assessment and recommendations on tangata whenua submission points related to the planning for and provision of infrastructure under section 4.2.5 of the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on these matters outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.06	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Support in part	The submission states that Tangata Whenua were heavily involved in the drafting of the papakāinga provisions, and held the pen throughout the technical crafting of provisions, objectives, policies and rules. The submitter fully support the chapter as a whole and that it is enabled in different zones, but seeks some changes to the provisions.	<b>Amend</b> the Papakāinga provisions to: - enable papakāinga in the Metropolitan, Local Centre and Mixed Use Zones; - not restrict papakāinga on Kāpiti Island; - address inconsistencies as noted in individual submissions.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.3 Papakāinga	Support is noted. Note that recommendations to amend the papakāinga provisions are made in response to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161), Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203), and others.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Noting recommendations to amend the provisions in response to several submissions.	Refer relevant submissions.
S210	S210.07	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Support in part	The submitter support the intent of the Marae Takiwā precinct (which they note was proposed by the Council) and states that it goes a very small way towards protecting their relationship with their 'taonga'. However, as proposed, Plan Change 2 will have significant impacts on their sites and areas of significance, and their taonga. Consequently, the provisions need to be more robust and further reaching.	<b>Amend</b> the provisions associated with the Marae Takiwā precinct to be more robust and further reaching.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	It is unclear what specific amendments are sought, although I note that I have made recommendations on amendments sought by Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai under S100.53 and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki under S203.37.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S210.07.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	General	Support primary submission	A.R.T seek several amendments to provide greater protection to areas of significance to tangata whenua, including: - Amending provisions associated with the Marae Takiwā to extend further and be more robust. - Concerns about a policy gap of enabling further intensification and development without reviewing the schedule of sites and areas of significance to iwi. Greater Wellington support these amendments.	Allow primary submission.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S210.07.FS02	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.12 Qualifying Matters - Marae Takiwā Precinct	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.08	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	General	Support in part	The submission supports the inclusion of Kārewarewa urupā as a wāhi tapu as a reflection of its history and appropriate future use. The submission states that Kārewarewa urupā has been used for the interment of both members of Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngāti Raukawa ki te tonga, Ngāti Toa Rangatira, and the Pākehā settler community. Members of Ātiawa have been on record since 1896 consistently testifying that it is an urupā and a wāhi tapu and the Waitangi Tribunal has provided an early report on it.  The submission states that the boundaries of the wāhi tapu are intended to reflect the original surveyed boundaries of the urupā, however, the extent of the south eastern edge of the urupā as shown in Appendix E of the IPI is not consistent with the surveyed boundary.	<b>Amend</b> the proposed boundaries of the wāhi tapu to be consistent with Figure 3 as noted in the Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai submission (refer to submission point S100.50).  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Support is noted.	<b>Accept.</b> Refer to S100.50 for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer to S100.50 for details.
S104.FS.1	S210.08.FS01	Waikanae Land Company	General	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.13 Qualifying Matters - Kārewarewa Urupā	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.09	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Not specified	The submission notes that it is important to recognise that their will be a policy gap of introducing intensification and medium density rules in the Plan, in the absence of including a new review of the Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to iwi and Māori in Kāpiti. The submitter is concerned that additional sites and their new spatial scope may not be provided protection at the level desired by Tangata Whenua.	<b>Amend</b> Plan Change 2 to add that there will be a policy gap as a result of introducing intensification and medium density rules in the District Plan, in the absence of including a new review of Schedule 9.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	I consider that the potential gap between the places acknowledged in Schedule 9 and places or areas of significance to Māori not included in the schedule is acknowledged under policy SASM-P1, which refers to the Council working in partnership with the relevant iwi authority for the ongoing and long term management and protection of wāhi tapu. This gap is also acknowledged under policy HH-P7, which relates to unidentified historic heritage (including wāhi tapu and other places and areas of significance to Māori).  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together on a broader review of sites and areas of significance to Māori as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S097.FS.1	S210.09.FS01	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support primary submission	A.R.T seek several amendments to provide greater protection to areas of significance to tangata whenua, including: - Amending provisions associated with the Marae Takiwā to extend further and be more robust. - Concerns about a policy gap of enabling further intensification and development without reviewing the schedule of sites and areas of significance to iwi. Greater Wellington support these amendments.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S104.FS.1	S210.09.FS02	Waikanae Land Company	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose primary submission	WLC opposes the submission points to the extent that they support the Wāhi Tapu listing. Refer to S104 for reasoning.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.6 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Qualifying Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S210	S210.10	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	DO-Ox3	Oppose	The submission states that DO-Ox3 purely gives effect to increased height and density within the parts of the General Residential Zone but fails to speak and link into Papakāinga and Tangata Whenua aspirations into the future. It does not account for the impacts on the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. The submitter's objection includes the objective being unable to cater for changing land use for Tangata Whenua when they receive land back through Settlement arrangements; the objective will be simply overtaking the rights and interests of Tangata Whenua by overlaying a 'residential intensification precinct' without Tangata Whenua involvement.	<b>Amend</b> DO-Ox3 to ensure the role of tangata whenua in the residential intensification precinct, and provide for papakāinga.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.11	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	DO-O11	Oppose	The submission states that amendments to the objective water down the protection of character and amenity values. The submission notes that character and amenity values have significant cultural and indigenous components (for instance, the presence of mature vegetation), but these are not referenced.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O11 to replace "recognise" with "maintain and enhance".  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S210.11.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-O11	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.12	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	DO-O11 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission opposes the explanatory text to DO-O11 as it does not communicate the significance of the places and spaces mentioned in the text to tangata whenua.  The submission notes that amendments proposed to the explanatory text give effect to Objective 4 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 by emphasising that the 'amenity values develop and change over time'. The submission opposes this reduced and unsubstantiated perspective to amending this section when it is known that amenity covers many different dimensions of cultural and indigenous identities which come from the past.  The submission also opposes language used in the proposed amendments, including: - replacing 'maintaining' with 'acknowledging'; - replacing 'avoiding the change in scale' with 'managing the change in scale'; - using language such as 'managing the change in existing character that may result from development'.	<b>Rewrite</b> the explanatory text to DO-O11 with mana whenua.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.4 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Cultural values as a component of amenity values	Refer to the body of the report.  In relation to the explanatory text to DO-O11, as noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to review this text as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.13	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	DO-O16	Oppose	The submission opposes the amendments to the wording of this objective on the basis that whilst it is amended to cater for 'providing for higher density urban built character and high-quality development in Metropolitan and town centre zones' the submitter is not assured that the environmental quality is provided for.	<b>Amend</b> DO-O16 to include an objective that the environment is provided for as part of proposals and that the environment must not be worse off.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	I consider that DO-O16 already seeks that a range of positive environmental outcomes are provided for within the District's centres. I do not consider that it would be appropriate to amend DO-O16 to require in general terms that the environment must not be worse off, as it implies that any adverse effect on the environment would be unacceptable. I consider this may be overly restrictive in that it does not leave room for an assessment of whether the adverse effects associated with development are reasonable.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S210.13.FS01	Jonas, Malu	DO-O16	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.2.1 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - General matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.14	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	DO-O16 (Explanatory Text)	Oppose	The submission identifies that the centres hierarchy could impact on the aspirations of Tangata Whenua and bringing these aspirations to fruition by way of dictating densities and heights at sites that are not appropriate.  The submission identifies that decisions to 'up zone' certain areas have flowed from the Centres Hierarchy, and that this will lead to visual and physical change in the hierarchy over time.  The submission states that it seems to have been left to Council's discretion as to how they arrange the centres in the hierarchy. The submission identifies that they way walkable catchments have been applied to centres appears to be arbitrary, and in breach of the centres hierarchy. Paekākāriki is an example of this.	<b>Amend</b> the explanatory text to DO-O16 to avoid the centres hierarchy being used as a barrier to: a. developing their own housing and land development aspirations (for instance, papakāinga, education etc.); b. implement and express their cultural practices; or c. implementing Tino Rangaitatanga.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.15	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	Design Guides	Not specified	The submission is concerned that the General Residential Zone leaves the appearance and amenity of neighbourhood changes to Design Guides which are expected to manage the impacts of medium density and high-density developments. Mana Whenua did not co-design these design-guides with the Council.  The submitter is not convinced a non-binding document that developers can push back on because they might want to cut off their costs could achieve a high standard of urban design and just to 'encourage' new development 'contribute' positively to the changing character of the zone.	<b>Establish</b> a Design Panel with tangata whenua representation to adequately assess the design of development.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.7 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Design Guides	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address this matter as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.16	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	PRECX1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Not specified	The submission raises several concerns in simply following the rapid transit stops definition to determine Residential Intensification Precinct A, as this creates zoning which may not be appropriate to implement. In particular the following matters of concern are noted: - the impacts of climate change; - lack of infrastructure; - high character values in specific precincts.  The submission also notes that in the Whanganui-a-Tara Johnsonville Catchment, the Johnsonville line did not pass for a rapid transit service, and in Auckland a lack of infrastructure has been regarded as a qualifying matter.	<b>Amend</b> Residential Intensification Precinct A with mana whenua input.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.2 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Application of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD	Refer to the body of the report.  As noted in the body of the report, there are opportunities for Council and tangata whenua to work together to address some of the matters raised under this submission point as part of one or more of the other plan changes being prepared by Council, as well as the range of other urban development planning activities undertaken by the Council outside of its district planning functions.	<b>Do not accept.</b> Noting that this recommendation does not preclude tangata whenua and Council from working together on this matter outside of the ISPP.	<b>No.</b>
S210	S210.17	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	FC-R5	Not specified	The submission notes that clause 1 only refers to land and money, and this may be limiting if Tangata Whenua are considered in the decision making for financial contributions.  The submission notes that clause 2 restricts further decisions that may need to be made if certain aspects of the proposed development and its impacts have not been well estimated and/or assessed into the project implementation stage.	Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Refer to S100.49, S161.45 and S203.54.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to S100.49, S161.45 and S203.54 for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer to S100.49, S161.45 and S203.54 for details.



Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S210	S210.18	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	FC-R5	Not specified	The submission notes that, depending on the location and nature of the proposal, Tangata Whenua would want involvement in determining the land and the amount regarding the contributions. The submission identifies that land should always be able to be offered to Tangata Whenua.	<b>Amend</b> FC-R5 to add additional phrases to include Tangata Whenua's principles and roles, as rangatiratanga (decision-maker) and kaitiakitanga along with Council partners.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Refer to S100.49, S161.45 and S203.54.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to S100.49, S161.45 and S203.54 for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Refer to S100.49, S161.45 and S203.54 for details.
S197.FS.1	S210.18.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	FC-R5	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S210.18.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	FC-R5	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S210	S210.19	A.R.T (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (of Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga) and Ngāti Toa Rangatira)	Offsetting and compensation	Oppose	The submission notes that the way the clause is written would mean that mana whenua accept the degradation or mauri.	<b>Delete</b> references to offsetting and compensation in the financial contributions provisions.  (Refer to the submissions of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai (S100), Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira on behalf of Ngāti Toa Rangatira (S161) and Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (S203) for details)	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Refer S161.44.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S197.FS.1	S210.19.FS01	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA)	Offsetting and compensation	Oppose primary submission	The RVA opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S196.FS.1	S210.19.FS02	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Offsetting and compensation	Oppose primary submission	Ryman opposes the relief sought as it is inconsistent with the financial contribution requirements of the RMA.	Disallow primary submission.	4.2.8 Matters raised by Tangata Whenua - Financial Contributions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S244.FS.1	S210.FS01	McDonald, Deidre	Full submission	Support primary submission	This submitter is particularly concerned, as are the original submitters, that the PPC2 decision-making 'and the intensification provisions also prejudice and jeopardise the outcomes of Treaty of Waitangi Settlements' (p 2 of the Submission). This potential Treaty breach as constitutional matter that requires urgent legal attention.  Agree with the following statements: <i>'If done poorly, housing and intensification can have enduring negative impacts on the relationship of iwi with our lands and waters...Proceeding with intensification before these steps are taken is irresponsible and neglectful of our taonga' (p. 3 of the Submissions).</i> <i>Agree that these provisions should make space for papakāinga housing in local and mixed used areas, including near the amenities of townships and schools for older people to be part of the community.</i>	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S054.FS.1	S210.FS02	Jonas, Malu	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission. The mental health of homeless and badly housed people is very important, as is the mental health of people currently living on the Kapiti Coast. Neither group should take precedence. All people need access to housing, services, social connections, and places to spiritually replenish.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S211	S211.01	Easterbrook-Smith, Sonja	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission supports the submission made by Glen Wiggs (S098).  The submission also states that their property is subject to regular flooding, and that intensification will further increase the risk of flooding. The submission also includes photographs of ponding.	<b>Amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the area shown as Coastal Environment in the District Plan. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S211.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond the narrow strip of coastal margin and that the current proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is insufficient. We support that the Precinct landward boundary be the Takutai Kapiti Adaptation Zone areas which are predicted to be subject to coastal hazards in the future.  Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S211	S211.02	Easterbrook-Smith, Sonja	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 211.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the landward (eastern) boundary of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts for the District (marked PRECx3) to be the landward boundary of the areas shown as the Adaptation Zones, which the Kapiti Coast District Council recently determined and published on its Takutai Kapiti Coastal Hazard Susceptibility Assessment maps ( <a href="https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b">https://maps.kapiticoast.govt.nz/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/dbc000c7263f4d63b8978047ed0e826b</a> ). And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S211	S211.03	Easterbrook-Smith, Sonja	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 211.01.	Further or alternatively, <b>amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include those areas at Waikanae Beach and Peka Peka Beach subject to inundation at 0.40m RSLR, 0.65m RSLR, 0.85m RSLR 1.25m RSLR or 1.65m RSLR on the KCDC Coastal Inundation Susceptibility Mapping Tool.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter E in the body of the report.	<b>Accept in part.</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.	<b>Yes.</b> Amend the spatial extent of PRECx3 - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the General Residential Zone at Peka Peka Beach (refer section 19.8 and Appendix F of PC(R1)). Amend the introduction to the General Residential Zone chapter (refer section 4.1 of PC(R1)).  <b>Section 32AA evaluation</b> Refer to the body of the report for details.
S211	S211.04	Easterbrook-Smith, Sonja	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	See submission point 211.01.	Further, or alternatively <b>amend</b> the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct to include the current Beach Residential Qualifying Precinct at Waikanae Beach, and that accordingly all existing Beach Residential Precinct plan provisions continue to apply to the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach and the Residential Intensification Precinct B PRECx2 be removed from the Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precinct at Waikanae Beach.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S212	S212.01	Neumann, Stefanie	General	Oppose	The submission states several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Kāpiti Island is a treasure that holds the community together. - There is no need to erect big and imposing buildings that will make the coast a more ugly place. - Kāpiti coast is a vibrant place. - A more considered approach would be to look at housing in conjunction with green spaces, mental health and architecture that considers the basics like positive and negative spaces; - The Council should make thoughtful decisions instead of building left, right and centre, without any guidelines, without protecting existing trees, without looking at quality of living and the health of the social network and without considering the impact on the environment. - The proposal to let people build 2 and 3 storey houses without consent will lead to a huge amount of selfish, unfriendly, uncooperative and entitled behaviour.	No specific decision is requested on the provisions of Plan Change 2, however the submission opposes the proposal to allow 3 storey buildings to be erected without consent, as well as up to 6 in the centres of towns, or in the case of Paraparaumu up to 12 storeys.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	I note that the District Plan is required incorporate the MDRS and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.  In relation to some of the matters raised by the submitter, I note that PC2 add design guidelines to the District Plan to provide urban design guidance to inform the design of high quality development in the district. I also note that trees that are schedule as notable trees, key indigenous trees or located within scheduled ecological sites will continue to be protected by the District Plan.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S212.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S213	S213.01	Middleton, Danie	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The submission agrees with the submission of William Glen Turner Wiggs (S098).	Refer to S098.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to S098.	Refer to S098.	Refer to S098.
S203.FS.1	S213.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged beyond the narrow strip of coastal margin and that the current proposed precinct is insufficient. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S214	S214.01	Chrip, Prue	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the utilisation of the Kāpiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct.  The submission also opposes the Council's interpretation and application of NZCPS Policy 24 and 25 and section 6 of the RMA.  The submitter does not wish to see any form of high rise buildings or residential homes built on the Kāpiti Coast.  The submitter supports the CRU submission (S119 and S218) and the WBRSI submission (S105).	Delete the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and replace with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S203.FS.1	S214.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct be enlarged beyond the Takutai Kāpiti Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results (Jacobs Volume 2). We agree to increasing the precinct to the referenced published Takutai Kāpiti project Adaptation Zones. Our culturally significant coastal environments along with our all our communities will be affected by sea level rise, coastal erosion, increased precipitation, groundwater saturation, flooding etc within the next 100 years. Limiting intensification in these coastal environments is aligned with the intention of current Government Policy and wise future decision making. Severe impacts are already happening nationwide. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S214	S214.02	Chrip, Prue	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S214.01, replace the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	Do not accept.	No.
S215	S215.01	Queere, Neville	PRECX1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Oppose	This submission is opposed to the boundary of Residential Intensification Precinct A, especially as it related to the hillside areas located beneath the Hemi Matenga Reserve, for the following reasons: - 6 storey intensification will negatively impact on the appearance and character on the area connected to the native bush reserve. The area adjacent to the Reserve is a continuation of territory occupied by resident native bird populations which will be diminished as a result of intensification. - The arbitrary designation of Precinct A "within 800 metres of the Waikanae Train Station" does not take into account the existing street parking issues along Kakariki Grove and Te Maku Grove streets. Parking is already limited due to the primary school in the area. Multi-storey residential buildings would require their own off-street parking and increase traffic movements significantly. - The designation of Precinct A does not take into account that the points above are located on a hillside, and that walking 800m uphill is a different matter to walking 800m on the flat. - Intensification of housing on the hillside beneath the Reserve will only result in current access issues over the rail line to the Town Centre and Main Road being exacerbated. As more commuter trains are available to destinations north of Waikanae there will be a further increase in the time the existing traffic light controlled rail crossing is closed to traffic. - Intensification of housing and more rapid population increase will put even more pressure on access to critical services (medical services) which are already under strain. The local volunteer fire brigade will likely be overstretched attending to fires and emergencies in multi-storey buildings.	This submission proposes moving the boundary of Residential Intensification Precinct A on the eastern side of the main trunk railway line westward to the west of Winara Avenue.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	I consider that removing the area to the east of the railway line at Waikanae from Residential Intensification Precinct A would be inconsistent with Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD, because this area is located within a walkable catchment of the Waikanae train station.  I also note the following in response to the matters raised in the submission: - While the increased building heights may result in a change to the appearance or character of the area, this outcome is anticipated by Objective 4 of the NPS-UD; - I do not consider the boundary of the precinct to be arbitrary, and I note that Appendix E to the Section 32 Evaluation Report describes how the boundary was generated; - I acknowledge that the methodology used to calculate walkable catchments does not account for the gradient of pedestrian network, however I consider this acceptable because the Ministry for the Environment guidance on implementing the intensification policies of the NPS-UD (which is referenced by Appendix E to the Section 32 Evaluation Report) considers an 800 metre walkable catchment to be a minimum size (see Ministry for the Environment (2020). Understanding and implementing intensification provisions for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, pp.23-24). In addition to this, Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD requires increased building heights to be enabled within at least a walkable catchment of rapid transit stops. - While I note the matters raised by the submitter in relation to the transport network, I consider that it is more appropriate to address these matters through the Long-term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy.	Do not accept.	No.
S054.FS.1	S215.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	PRECX1 - Residential Intensification Precinct A	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Utauta St, Hira St, and the southern half of Seddon St, Winara Ave, and Elizabeth St are even more congested than Te Maku Grove. This does not just apply to parking. It applies to any traffic movement at all during 'busy' times. Seddon St and Winara Ave are also the two main routes northward further along Waikanae East. Development is already occurring in the northern areas of Waikanae East. The main routes there are fed exclusively by Winara Ave and Seddon St before Huia St starts. Elizabeth St is our only biking or driving entrance to all of Waikanae East from the Kapiti Coast. It is highly congested frequently due to being blocked by frequent trains to Waikanae Station. S054 has various solutions.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.5 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - Residential Intensification Precincts	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S216	S216.01	Webber, Allison	Paekākāriki	Oppose	This submission is opposed to increasing the height restrictions in and around Paekākāriki, for the following reasons: - It will target the 'wrong' end of the market. - The people who are currently locked out of living in Paekākāriki (because it is unaffordable) are largely low income families and mana whenua (10 years ago 64 members of Ngati Haumia hapu lived in the village, now there are only 4). - The creation of high-rise apartments around the railway station is not likely to solve the problem identified above. They are likely to be unaffordable and probably not suitable for the families wanting and needing them. - This proposition is a 'one size fits all' and won't solve housing problems in Paekākāriki. KDCDC needs to look for solutions at the northern edge of the village, where the urban fringe connects to Queen Elizabeth Park and the Paekākāriki Community Reserve. The submitter realises this is outside the scope of this plan change. - Increased building heights and intensification in and around the town centre are completely inappropriate for the size and scale of a village with approximately 900 inhabitants. - The new buildings will cast a shadow over the existing village centre and impact the quality of street life people currently enjoy. The vibe of Paekākāriki is centred on a relaxed casual way of life where people 'hang out with each other, shop and have coffee'. Increased building heights will cast a pall over this.	This submission proposes <b>retaining</b> building heights at existing levels and <b>engage</b> in a new planning initiative to expand opportunities for housing at the northern end of the village.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S216.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	Paekākāriki	Support primary submission	Support this submission. These properties are better suited to development, due to already being connected with cycle lanes etc.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S216.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Paekākāriki	Support primary submission	NHoO supports the recommendation for intensification to have more regard for neighbouring properties and community values.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S217	S217.01	Frauenstein, Martin	General	Oppose	This submission is opposed to the proposal of 6 storey buildings in their area, for the following reasons: - Located in a designated flood zone. - The area already experiences random water pressure drops. - There are 2 notified trees on the property of the submitter, and clarification is requested regarding whether these will now be allowed to be removed to facilitate intensification. According to the district plan, they are there to maintain or enhance the nature of the environment and have historical significance. - Clarification required regarding how the increased population will travel of public transport when it is closed by slips (between Paekākāriki and Pukerua Bay). - The current infrastructure cannot accommodate a 6 fold increase in population.	This submission proposes <b>halting</b> all intensification changes to the district plan, <b>engage</b> with the residents of Kapiti Coast, <b>undertake</b> a district wide referendum vote on the district plan.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	The decision requested by the submitter would not be consistent with sections 77G and 77N of the RMA, which require the District Plan to incorporate the Medium Density Residential Standards and give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S054.FS.1	S217.01.FS01	Jonas, Malu	General	Support primary submission	Support this submission. Cannot be described as 'rapid' or 'reliable' to cater for the current population, let alone the projected population.	Allow primary submission.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S203.FS.1	S217.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	General	Support primary submission	NHoO supports the recommendation for intensification to have more regard for neighbouring properties and community values.	Allow primary submission in part.	4.4.1 MDRS & NPS-UD - General - General Matters	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S218	S218.01	Coastal Ratepayers United Inc	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission opposes the use of the <i>Kapiti Coast Coastal Hazards Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment Report Volume 2: Results</i> (Jacobs Volume 2) as a basis for the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Further analysis of risks from coastal hazards is required before using the Jacobs Volume 2 report for any district plan coastal hazard provisions. - Using the results of Jacobs Volume 2 is speculative and premature.  The submission opposes the interpretation and application of NZCPS policies 24 and 25 for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - Jacobs Volume 2 is not a coastal hazard risk assessment. - The scenario used by Plan Change 2 from the Jacobs Volume 2 report should not be used by policy makers and does not give effect to the NZCPS. - Because the approach taken by Plan Change 2 does not implement policy 24 and is premature in terms of policy 25 of the NZCPS, it is not "required" under s77(b) of the RMA.  The submission opposes the Council's interpretation and application of section 6 of the RMA for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - The use of a "highly unlikely" sea level rise scenario to define the spatial extent of the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct is not in accordance with s6(h) of the RMA. - The Council has failed to recognise and provide for section 6(a) of the RMA. - The Council is required to include a qualifying matter to preclude intensification that would amount to inappropriate use and development of the coastal environment, and/or which would fail to preserve the remaining natural character of the coastal environment.  The submission opposes the inconsistent approach to a qualifying area based on coastal erosion for several reasons, including (but not limited to): - The District Plan includes overlays for flooding, ponding and surface flow, but these have not reflected these in corresponding Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts. - The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct should be defined on the basis of further advancing a range of NZCPS character and protection objectives and policies where these areas are already identified in the District Plan. - The submission supports an approach that mirrors the identification of "Adaptation Areas" as defined under the Takutai Kāpiti project.	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct, and <b>replace</b> with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a new enlarged area based on further advancing the NZCPS objectives and policies already addressed in the District Plan. At a minimum, this would include all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S186.FS.1	S218.01.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.

Sub #	Submission point number	Submitter name	Specific provision/matter	Position	Reasons (this may be a summary only, refer to the submission for full reasoning)	Decision requested	Evidence section	Assessment	Officer's recommendation	Amendments to PC(N)?
S203.FS.1	S218.01.FS02	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the basis for Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts take on further climate change impact considerations that the limited coastal hazard risk assessment identified in Jacobs Volume 2 report. We recommend that the 'Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct' should not be confined to a narrow strip of coast subject to coastal erosion, the area identified should include other known coastal hazards being identified and predicted to affect our district such as flooding, ground saturation, severe storm surges etc. We agree the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct needs to be enlarged landward of the proposed eastern boundary.  Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged landward of the eastern boundary. We agree that the Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S218	S218.02	Coastal Ratepayers United Inc	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submitter has identified an alternative option if Council chooses to base the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct on coastal hazard identification. This alternative is to only include land and properties currently identified in the District Plan as within the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. The submitter considers it is the only lawfully defensible approach in this circumstance, given Council has not yet implemented NZCPS Policy 24 via a plan change specifically addressing coastal hazards. The submitter states this is not their preferred approach.	Alternatively to submission point S218.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes only that land and those properties that are currently identified in the District Plan as the 'no build' and 'relocatable' coastal hazard zones. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Refer to the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S186.FS.1	S218.02.FS01	Gunn, Ian and Jean	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Wish to see the coastal qualifying matters amended to ensure all risks from the sea are included (tsunami, inundation). The submitter highlight the issues reinforcing primary submission, that any intensification at Paraparaumu Beach needs to be restricted to the current high rise zones. These submissions highlight the lack of facilities, the change of character, the lack of a cohesive zone, the failure to identify all the natural hazards (including stormwater), and the impact on the local biodiversity and the natural character.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.1 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - CRU Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S225.FS.2	S218.FS01	Tate, Karen	Full submission	Support primary submission	Support this submission opposing development of Waikanae Old Beach, for the reasons listed above.	Allow primary submission.	4.1.2 Further submission on full primary submission	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S219	S219.01	Poole, Sally	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct does not fully satisfy a range of policies in the NZCPS, whereas the Coastal Environment, as defined in the operative District Plan, does; - The s32 report does not fully comply with the NZCPS 2010. - Because the Operative District Plan is not compliant with NZCPS 2010, the area defined within the Coastal Environment must become the status quo.	<b>Delete</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct. <b>Replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct whose landward boundary is the landward boundary of the area shown as the "Coastal Environment" in the District Plan. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter A in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S203.FS.1	S219.01.FS01	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Support primary submission	Agree that the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precincts be enlarged beyond the narrow strip of coastal margin and that the current proposed precincts are insufficient. Takutai Kāpiti Coastal Hazards Adaptation Zones be marked as Coastal Environment and become Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct in the District Plan.	Allow primary submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Further submission considered as part of assessment of the primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.	Refer to primary submission above.
S219	S219.02	Poole, Sally	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	This approach better satisfies Policies 1, 6, 13, 14 and 19 contained within NZCPS 2010, whereas none of these policies are fully satisfied by the area currently defined as the Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct (CQMP).	Alternatively to submission point S219.01, <b>replace</b> the proposed Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct with a Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct that includes all land identified as the "Adaptation Area" in the Takutai Kāpiti GIS Map Viewer maps. And such further or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter B in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S219	S219.03	Poole, Sally	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Not specified	The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements".	<b>Amend</b> PC2 so that existing Beach Residential Precincts become Beach Residential Qualifying Matter Precincts. And such further or other consequential relief as required to give effect to the submission.	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer the assessment of Matter F in the body of the report.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S219	S219.04	Poole, Sally	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The use of the Jacobs V2 lines to develop the CQMPs is not required by, and is inconsistent with clauses 3.32 and 3.33 of the National Policy Statement Urban Development 2020. - It is inappropriate to use the Jacobs report as a means to circumvent the required plan change that the Council has to promote on the Coastal Environment. It is an incomplete assessment and one that has not been subject to appropriate scrutiny.	<b>Delete</b> all evidence derived from the incorrect use of Jacobs V1 & V2. Amend S32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within Jacobs V1 & V2. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	Refer to section 4.11.1 of the body of the report for discussion on the use of the Jacobs Assessment as part of PC2.  I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>
S219	S219.05	Poole, Sally	Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct	Oppose	The submission lists reasons which includes (but is not limited to) the following matters: - The disclaimer in the MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017 on page 2, that this "has no official status and so does not alter the laws.... other official guidelines or requirements". - The guidance does not correctly state the law that it is telling councils how to administer.	<b>Delete</b> all evidence derived from the incorrect use of MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. Amend s32 reports for PC2 to correctly state NZCPS 2010 provisions and, in particular, remove all references/use/analysis of all material (including maps) found within MfE Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance for Local Government 2017. (This removal would continue into all s42 reports.)	4.11.2 Qualifying Matters - Coastal Qualifying Matter Precinct - Beach Residential Submissions	I consider that recommendations must be on the IPI. Because the Section 32 Evaluation Report and this planning evidence are not part of the IPI, I do not consider that recommendations on the IPI can be used to alter or limit the matters contained within these reports.	<b>Do not accept.</b>	<b>No.</b>