

Further Submission for the Proposed District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Privacy Statement

Your further submission must include your name, and an address for service (preferably email, but you can use a postal address). All information you include in this further submission, including your name and address for service, will be provided to other submitters and published on Hutt City Council's website. Paper copies may also be made available. Hutt City Council is required to collect and publish this information to carry out its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 and to enable others to take part in the district plan process. The Council, other submitters, and the Environment Court may need to contact you during this process.

If your further submission does not include your name and an address for service, it will be rejected.

While the Council will retain all information provided in your further submission in secure council systems, all contact details will be removed from any documents published on Council's website once the district plan process is complete. However, your name and the contents of your further submission will still appear in these documents.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at contact@huttcity.govt.nz, call 04-570-6666, or write to us at Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040.

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. **This is a further submission from:**

Full Name	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Last First </div>	
Company/Organisation	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	
Contact if different	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	
Address	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Number Street </div>	
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Suburb </div>	
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> City Postcode </div>	
Address for Service if different	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Postal Address </div>	
Phone	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Home Work </div>	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Mobile </div>
Email	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	

2. This is a **further submission** in support of or opposition to a submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan.

3. I consider that, under Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act, I may make a further submission because:

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest

Please give details:

I have an interest in the Proposed Plan Change that is greater than the interest of the general public

Please give details:

I represent Hutt City Council

4. I support or oppose the submission of:

Name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. The reasons for my support or opposition are:

Please give reasons:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

7. I seek that the whole or part [*describe part*] of the submission be allowed or disallowed:

Please give precise details:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

8. I **wish** **do not wish** to be heard in support of my submission

(Please tick one)

9. If others make a similar submission,

I **will** **will not** consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

(Please tick one)

Signature of submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

	<i>Date</i>
--	-------------

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

To: Hutt City Council (“Council”)
district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

Date: 22 July 2025

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Submitter Name: McDonald’s Restaurants (NZ) Limited

Submitter No. 174

Address for Service: Barker & Associates Ltd
Attn Ashleigh Wharam / Matt Norwell
Level 2, 60 Cuba Street,
Te Aro, Wellington 6011

Email: AshleighW@barker.co.nz / MattN@barker.co.nz

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 8(1) OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RMA

McDonald’s Restaurants (NZ) Limited have an interest in the proposed district plan greater than the interest that the general public has because the submitter currently operates three established restaurants within the Hutt City district and the contents of District Plan provisions are integral to the continuing operation and development of McDonald’s in Lower Hutt.

ATTENDANCE AT COUNCIL HEARING

McDonald’s Restaurants (NZ) Limited wishes to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of our submission.

If others make a submission, McDonald’s Restaurants (NZ) Limited will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Person authorised to sign on behalf of McDonald’s Restaurants (NZ) Limited.



Matt Norwell

Director

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Queenstown | Wānaka

McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited (McDonald's) Further Submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
Bunnings Ltd	173.2	TR – Transport TR-R3.2	Oppose in part	Does not oppose provision in its entirety, as it relates to the Metropolitan Centre Zone, but seeks to ensure that the matters of discretion are appropriate, include recognition of operational and functional needs thereby recognising that trade supply retail should be supported for the positive contribution they make to the viability and function of these centres. Opposes reference to a financial contribution within the matters of discretion for the reasons detailed in Part 2 below (refer to original submission for full reasons)	Amend the matters of discretion under TR-R3.2 as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent that the development provides for active and public transport modes. 2. Positive effects on facilitating the uptake of active and public transport modes where in relation to any matter specified in TRP7: Positive effects. 3. <u>The operational and functional needs of the activity to exceed the high trip generation threshold.</u> 4. Effects on the capacity, safety, efficiency, and multi-modal function of the transport network. 5. Whether safe and effective access can be provided and maintained for emergency service vehicles to the site and within the transport network. 6. The design of transport facilities and their integration with the transport network. 7. Whether any improvements to the transport network are proposed or required as a <u>direct</u> result of the <u>proposed</u> activity, and a financial contribution has been made in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Contributions chapter. 8. The transport needs of activities on the site. 9. Any cumulative adverse effects.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.2b	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.4	EW – Earthworks EW-S1.2	Oppose in part	Limit does not reflect the generally larger scale of sites and required earthworks to enable commercial and industrial activities.	Amend EW-S1.2 as follows for Commercial and industrial Zones: 1. The area of earthworks must not exceed <u>3000m²</u> 500m² per site in any 12-month period.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.6	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.5	FC - Financial Contributions	Oppose	Consider that the Financial Contributions chapter does not provide sufficient guidance as to how/when Financial Contributions would be required by Council. This leaves the discretion to Council and has the potential to disincentivise development.	Seeks reconsideration of Financial Contributions chapter to reduce discretion and provide clearer guidance for council and developers.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.7	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.6	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially	Oppose in part	Opposed to all ground level car parking (on sites subject to Active Street Frontage Overlay) being considered as a potentially incompatible activity in the Metropolitan Centre Zone. The policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity and vitality therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. Trade supply retail activities generally seek to provide on-site customer car	Amend MCZ-P3 is as follows: Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> on sites subject to the Active Street Frontage Overlay;	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.10b	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		incompatible activities)		parking. This policy will act as a deterrent to development in these commercial zones.				
Bunnings Ltd	173.7	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-R18 (Carparking activities)	- Oppose in part	Opposes the rules pertaining to carparking activities which does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent. Reconfiguration of an existing carpark within the same area of the site, including where that reconfiguration results in a change to the type and/or number of parking or loading spaces provided should not need consent. Further, accessible parking should be provided for as a permitted activity	Amend MCZ-R18 as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with: i. CCZ-S6: Active frontages – Existing vehicle crossings, ii. CCZ-S8: Location and design of carparking, b. The carparking is not accessed with a vehicle crossing over an Active Street Frontage Overlay B, and c. The carparking is not accessed with a vehicle crossing over an Active Street Frontage Overlay A; or <u>d. Reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u> <u>e. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u>	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.13b	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.8a	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S4 (Active frontages - Buildings and structures)	- Oppose in part	Recognises the intent of the active street frontage controls but considers that they do not appropriately recognise existing development. It is considered that these controls should apply to new buildings and new development only and the requirements should be adjusted such that they do not apply in the case of small change/addition to a building/site but rather only in a substantial redevelopment of a site. In Bunnings experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.	CZ-S4 as follows: On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay, <u>any new buildings shall provide the following:</u> ... 3. The buildings must not have a featureless façade on the front boundary of more than 3.4 m in width at any part of the building between 0.5m and 2.5m in height above footpath level <u>and roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> 6. The Any new building must have the principal public entrance on: a. An Active Street Frontage Overlay A frontage, if any, b. Otherwise, an Active Street Frontage Overlay B frontage, if any, c. Otherwise, an Active Street Frontage Overlay C frontage. 7. Roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.15a	Allow submission
Bunnings Ltd	173.8b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone	- Oppose in part	Recognises the intent of the active street frontage controls but considers that they do not appropriately recognise existing development. It is considered that these controls should apply to new buildings and new development only and the requirements should be adjusted such that they	Amend MCZ-S5 as follows: 1. Where any building is constructed, added to, or altered on a site with a frontage in the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B, it must provide a verandah or	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.15c	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-S5 (Active frontages - required verandahs)		do not apply in the case of small change/addition to a building/site but rather only in a substantial redevelopment of a site. In Bunnings experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.	canopy in legal road along the length of the Active Street Frontage Overlay that:			
Bunnings Ltd	173.9	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose in part	Opposes the standards pertaining to carparking activities and the location of parking which requires the provision of on-site car parking to be located within, underneath, on top of, or at the rear of the building which it serves. These rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as trade supply retail, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts. Bunnings considers that if the car parking is not visible then this should be a permitted activity.	Amend MCZ-S8 as follows: On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B: 1. Carparking must only be located: a. within or underneath a building, or b. on top of a building at least 3m above ground level, or c. shielded from the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B by a building, or d. <u>otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> 2. Carparking may not be served by a <u>new</u> vehicle crossing across an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B. On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay C: 3. Carparking must only be located within or underneath a building, on top of a building at least 3 metres above ground level, beside a building accounting for no more than 50% of the width of the site, or behind a building, <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space</u>	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.16b	Allow submission
Z Energy Limited	468.17	Definitions High generating activity trip	Oppose in part	Not appropriate to single out a particular activity as a high-trip generating activity - this is not an effects based approach. Inclusion in definition suggests any changes to an existing change, irrespective of nature of change or traffic generated, would be a high trip generating activity. Refer to original submission for full reasons and examples	Amend definition as follows: "means: a. a service station, b. a drive-through activity, or e. any other activity which exceeds a threshold in TR-Table 8 High trip generating activity thresholds, including when assessed cumulatively with all other activities with which on-site motor vehicle access spaces are shared."		Aligns with McDonald's submission (174.4) that separation of these activities is unnecessary and may cause confusion for users of the district plan.	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	471.69	Definitions High trip generating activities	Oppose	Clause (c) of the definition sets a threshold above which activities will be considered to be high trip generating activity (TR-Table 8). This is an appropriate effects-based approach. The definition uses both a threshold approach and specifically identifies two activity types (service stations and drive-through activities). It is inappropriate and unnecessary to mix both approaches in a single definition. Service stations primarily attract pass-by visits of motorists already travelling on the roading rather than acting as a destination activity that, in itself, draws traffic to a specific location. There are many other activities, such as supermarkets, education, sports and entertainment facilities that would more appropriately be considered high trip generating activities, but which are not specifically listed in the definition.	Amend the definition of "high trip generating activities" as follows: "means: a. a service station, b. a drive through activity, or c. any other activity which exceeds a threshold in TR-Table 8 High trip generating activity thresholds, including when assessed cumulatively with all other activities with which on-site motor vehicle access spaces are shared."	Support	Aligns with McDonald's submission (174.4) that separation of these activities is unnecessary and may cause confusion for users of the district plan.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.16	SIGN – Signs SIGN-S2 (Combined area of signs per site)	Oppose in part	Based on the area that is permitted per site, this combined total area is too low. Is likely to be exceeded by a single sign. Large format retail with multiple frontages often have signage on multiple facades. Modest additional signage is likely to require consent	Amend as follows: ".... (2). The maximum total area of signs per site (other than official signs, temporary signs and election signs) is 2070 m ²"	Support	McDonald's agrees that the limit on signage is low and would likely require consent for any restaurant activity signage.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.1b	CCZ - City Centre Zone	Oppose in part	Purpose of zone and activities provided for, conflicts with planned character and built form, listed incompatible activities and Standards Challenging to see how permitted activities such as supermarkets could feasibly develop or redevelop within parameters of Standards Objectives and policies do not recognise functional realities of some activities, thereby consent pathway will be challenging.	Seeks reconsideration of the CCZ framework to achieve greater alignment and support of permitted activities. (Refer to original submission).	Support	This submission point generally aligns with McDonald's submission.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.2	CCZ - City Centre Zone CCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	Oppose in part	Policy identifies ground-level car parking as a potentially incompatible activity within the Active Street Frontage Overlay. Carparking is a standalone activity even when ancillary to an otherwise permitted activity This suggests the zone is only supportive of part of a land use and not those components (carparking) which allow it function Heavy focus in policy on urban design outcomes For permitted land use activities which rely on car parking to function, difficult to achieve alignment.	Amend the policy direction to recognise the functional realities of activities that are best located in the City Centre Zone.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.9a	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.4	CCZ - City Centre Zone CCZ-R4 (Alterations and additions to	Oppose in part	Potential for alterations to require consent, due to existing building design not complying with Active Frontage Controls, even if alteration not modifying external building form	Amend provision to create a separate permitted activity rule for 'alterations', or amend provision so that 'alterations' are only required to achieve compliance with criteria CCZ-R4(b) and (c).	Support	This submission point generally aligns with McDonald's submission points regarding the applicability of Active	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		existing buildings and structures)					Frontage Controls to existing development.	
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.8	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	- Oppose in part	Policy identifies ground-level car parking as a potentially incompatible activity within the Active Street Frontage Overlay. Carparking is a standalone activity even when ancillary to an otherwise permitted activity This suggests the zone is only supportive of part of a land use and not those components (carparking) which allow it function Heavy focus in policy on urban design outcomes. For permitted land use activities which rely on car parking to function, difficult to achieve alignment.	Amend the policy direction to recognise the functional realities of activities that are located in the Metropolitan Centre Zone and serve the community	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.10b	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.9	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P4 (Likely incompatible activities)	- Oppose in part	Where an existing vehicle crossing in the overlay, is the only crossing serving an activity, should be able to retained without being considered incompatible. Other objectives and policies are strong enough to achieve purpose without total removal of existing environment	Amend policy to exclude existing vehicle crossings on Active Street Frontage Overlay B, from being likely incompatible.	Support	This submission point generally aligns with McDonald's submission points regarding the applicability of Active Frontage Controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.10	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-R4 (Alterations and additions to existing buildings and structures)	- Oppose in part	Potential for alterations to require consent, due to existing building design not complying with Active Frontage Controls, even if alteration not modifying external building form	Amend provision to create a separate permitted activity rule for 'alterations', or Amend provision so that 'alterations' are only required to achieve compliance with criteria MCZ-R4(b) and (c)	Support	This submission point generally aligns with McDonald's submission points regarding the applicability of Active Frontage Controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.15	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S6 (Active frontages – Existing vehicle crossings)	-	As notified, the Standard does not provide for development in Active Frontage Overlay A or B, unless existing vehicle crossings are removed. Non-compliance likely even for modest development not related to vehicle access. Overly restrictive for established land uses Reference in discretion matter #5 about closing crossings has no supporting context in chapter overview, objectives or policies, unclear if means temporary or permanent closure. Closing public access to existing land uses	Amend standard to include an exception that this standard not apply to an existing access where it is the only public vehicle access to the site. Amend matters of discretion as follows: "Matters of discretion if the standard is breached: ... 5. Effects on the current or potential future ability of the road to be closed to general motor vehicle traffic. ..."	Support	This submission point generally aligns with McDonald's submission points regarding the applicability of Active Frontage Controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.07	TR – Transport TR-R3 (All activities – Trip generation)			Amend the matters of discretion under TR-R3.2 as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent that the development provides for active and public transport modes.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.2b	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
					<p>2. Positive effects on facilitating the uptake of active and public transport modes where in relation to any matter specified in TRP7: Positive effects.</p> <p>3. <u>The operational and functional needs of the activity to exceed the high trip generation threshold.</u></p> <p>4. Effects on the capacity, safety, efficiency, and multi-modal function of the transport network.</p> <p>5. Whether safe and effective access can be provided and maintained for emergency service vehicles to the site and within the transport network.</p> <p>6. The design of transport facilities and their integration with the transport network.</p> <p>7. Whether any improvements to the transport network are proposed or required as a <u>direct</u> result of the <u>proposed</u> activity, and a financial contribution has been made in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Contributions chapter.</p> <p>8. The transport needs of activities on the site.</p> <p>9. Any cumulative adverse effects.</p>			
Foodstuffs North Island	239.11	FC - Financial Contributions	Oppose	Considers "...chapter does not provide sufficient guidance as to how/when Financial Contributions would be required by Council. This leaves the discretion to Council and has the potential to disincentivise development. Further, this is in direct conflict with s108(10)(b) of the RMA as the level of contribution is not clearly determined in the PDP."	Seeks that the Financial Contributions chapter be removed, or at the least amended to reduce discretion and provide clearer guidance for council and developers.	Support	Supports McDonalds submission 174.7	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.12	CCZ - City Centre Zone CCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)		If carparking not visible no effect on visual amenity, will deter development in zone for supermarkets that seek to provide onsite customer parking		Support	Supports McDonalds submission 174.10a	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.17	CCZ - City Centre Zone CCZ-S4 (Active frontages – Buildings and structures)	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports McDonalds submission 174.14a	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.27	CCZ - City Centre Zone	Oppose		Seeks that CCZ-R18, MCZ-R18, LCZ-R13 and NCZ-R13 should provide for reconfiguration of an existing	Support	Supports McDonalds submission 174.13a	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		CCZ-R18 (Carparking activities)			carpark, accessible parking and electric vehicle charging spaces as permitted activities. Suggested additional wording to the rules: <u>x. The carparking is the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area (including where that reconfiguration results in a change to the type and/or number of parking or loading spaces provided) within the existing site boundary, provided that the existing carpark area within the site is not expanded; or</u> <u>x. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u>			
Foodstuffs North Island	239.27	CCZ - City Centre Zone CCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose	Considers that "these rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as supermarkets in particular, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.", plus other reasons not specific to this relief - see original submission.	Seeks that CZ-S8, MCZ-S8 and LCZ-S8 should provide for car parking that is not visible from the street frontage as a permitted activity. Suggested additional wording to the standards: <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space</u>	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.21	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-S4 (Active frontages – Buildings and structures)	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.15b	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.22	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-S5 (Active frontages – Required verandahs)	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.15d	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.29	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-R13 (Carparking activities)	Oppose		Seeks that CCZ-R18, MCZ-R18, LCZ-R13 and NCZ-R13 should provide for reconfiguration of an existing carpark, accessible parking and electric vehicle charging spaces as permitted activities. Suggested additional wording to the rules:	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.13c	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
					<p>x. <u>The carparking is the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area (including where that reconfiguration results in a change to the type and/or number of parking or loading spaces provided) within the existing site boundary, provided that the existing carpark area within the site is not expanded; or</u></p> <p>x. <u>The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u></p>			
Foodstuffs North Island	239.33	LCZ - Local Centre Zone LCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	Oppose	Considers that "these rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as supermarkets in particular, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts."	<p>Seeks that CZ-S8, MCZ-S8 and LCZ-S8 should provide for car parking that is not visible from the street frontage as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Suggested additional wording to the standards: <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space</u></p>	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.16c	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.13	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	Oppose	If carparking not visible no effect on visual amenity, will deter development in zone for supermarkets that seek to provide onsite customer parking		Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.9b	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.19	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.15a	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.20	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S5	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.15c	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.28	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone	Oppose		Seeks that CCZ-R18, MCZ-R18, LCZ-R13 and NCZ-R13 should provide for reconfiguration of an existing carpark, accessible parking and electric vehicle charging spaces as permitted activities.	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.13b	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				McDonald's Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-R18			<p>Suggested additional wording to the rules:</p> <p><u>x. The carparking is the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area (including where that reconfiguration results in a change to the type and/or number of parking or loading spaces provided) within the existing site boundary, provided that the existing carpark area within the site is not expanded; or</u></p> <p><u>x. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u></p>			
Foodstuffs North Island	239.32	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S8	- Oppose	<p>Considers that "these rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as supermarkets in particular, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.", plus other reasons not specific to this relief - see original submission.</p>	<p>Seeks that CZ-S8, MCZ-S8 and LCZ-S8 should provide for car parking that is not visible from the street frontage as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Suggested additional wording to the standards: <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space</u></p>	Support	Supports McDonald's submission 174.16b	Allow submission