

Porirua's Proposed District Plan 2020

Submission on Porirua's Proposed District Plan

To - Environment and City Planning Team

Date received 20/11/2020

Submission Reference Number #61

Wishes to be heard? Yes

Is willing to present a joint case? No

Could gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission? No

Directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission? No

Address for service:

Jacobson Mike & Christine / 61

22 Lambley Road Titahi Bay Porirua 5022

Phone: 042360857

Mobile: 0276527265

Email: ngakereru@gmail.com

Submission points

Point 61.1

Support / Support in part / Oppose

Support

Section: GRZ - General Residential Zone

Sub-section: Rules

Provision

GRZ-R7 Minor residential unit

1. Activity status: **Permitted**

Where:

- a. No more than one minor residential unit occupies the site; and
- b. The minor residential unit does not exceed a gross floor area of 50m².

2. Activity status: **Discretionary**

Where:

- a. Compliance is not achieved with GRZ-R7-1.a or GRZ-R7-1.b.

Notification:

An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified in accordance with section 95A of the RMA.

Submission

This will allow better utilisation of larger residential properties for meeting accommodation needs in the city.

Relief sought

Retain this rule

Point 61.2**Support / Support in part / Oppose**

Support in part

Section: GRZ - General Residential Zone

Sub-section: Standards

Provision

GRZ-S4 Setback from boundary with a road

1. Buildings and structures must not be located within a 4m setback from a boundary with a road except:

- a. On a site with two or more boundaries to a road, the building or structure must not be located within a 2m setback from the boundary with one road; and
- b. Where any garage and/or carport with a vehicle door or vehicle opening facing the road, it must not be located within a 5m setback from the boundary with the road.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. The streetscape and amenity of the area;
2. The design and siting of the building or structure;
3. Screening, planting and landscaping of the building or structure;
4. Pedestrian and cyclist safety (see TR-P3); and
5. Whether topographical or other site constraints that make compliance with the standard impractical.

This standard does not apply to:

- Fences and standalone walls — see GRZ-R4;
- Buildings and structures that are no more than 2m² in floor area and 2m in height above ground level; or
- Eaves up to a maximum of 600mm in width and external gutters or downpipes (including their brackets) up to an additional width of 150mm.

Submission

I seek clarification in this standard and S5 regarding the requirements where there is a boundary with a public street-to-street walkway (such as our adjacent walkway between Lambley Road and Richard Street). I note that this walkway is deemed to be a road in relation to fencing costs.

Relief sought

It is my submission that such a boundary with a public street-to-street walkway should be covered (specifically included in) GRZ-S5. That is, the 1m setback and S2 height in relation to boundary standards should apply et al.

Point 61.3**Support / Support in part / Oppose**

Support in part

Section: FUZ - Future Urban Zone**Sub-section:** FUZ - Future Urban Zone**Provision**

Council's Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (2019) identified a need for additional land for housing and business purposes over the next thirty-years. The Future Urban Zone applies to Greenfield land that has been identified as being suitable for these purposes. It is a holding zone where land can continue to be used for a range of rural activities, and subdivision and urban development are discouraged until a structure plan is prepared and the land rezoned. Structure planning helps achieve an optimal type, form and extent of urban development, and demonstrates how future development can be adequately serviced by infrastructure.

Submission

I wish to make a submission related to the zoning of rural land in the vicinity of the Future Urban Zone on the Judgeford Flats. (It is not clear where one should make a submission that in effect seeks an additional Special Purpose Zone or an extension of the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone...)

In an earlier draft District Plan that was consulted on by Council, there was provision for Rural Lifestyle (or similar) zoning to the east and north of the the Future Urban Zone on the Judgeford Flats. That zone apparently included rural areas where additional residential/rural activity would not compromise the roading network and had more flat/gently sloping land (and otherwise did not threaten the environmental and character values of the rural area?).

If my memory serves me correctly, that early draft Plan did not include the Future Urban Zone on the Judgeford Flats.

It is not clear why such a Rural Lifestyle (or similar) zoning has been abandoned in its entirety around the eastern part of the Judgeford flats and the southern end of Moonshine Road, rather than being refined to achieve a number of desirable outcomes for Porirua City.

I believe that the creation of the Future Urban Zone on the Judgeford Flats has in fact increased the desirability of such Rural Lifestyle (or similar) zoning in that area.

There is increasing recognition that hub development is important for transport/carbon/wellbeing/cultural reasons, and that having people living and working in an area instead of divorcing workplace areas and habitation areas has many advantages. Apartments in the city are just the most obvious example of this.

If there is to be a commercial and transport hub developed on the Judgeford Flats, why has there been zero provision for some of the people working in that hub to be able to live in the vicinity on rural lifestyle sized properties where undesirable effects can be avoided?

Why is there no provision of a buffer between the commercial and transport hub and the general rural zone? There could be reverse sensitivity issues, and there is little evidence that the existing commercial activities at BRANZ create or suffer from effects of nearby dwellings/habitation.

It is notable that the Rural Lifestyle Zone to the west of the FUZ Judgeford Flats does border on that FUZ, so clearly Council planners do not see a problem with the two zones being next to each other. By way of contrast, the proposed plan includes a SPZ (BRANZ), and refers to the large scale campus. Is notable that BRANZ workers benefit from the proximity of varied rural and rural lifestyle type properties to their workplace - as evidenced by the number of BRANZ staff that walk up Moonshine Road every lunchtime. However the land around is shown as rural.

At hearings, i would wish to explore the advantages of providing rural lifestyle type zoning around the remaining boundaries of the FUZ Judgeford Flats where there are indeed no impediments to that in the way of adverse effects, such as effects on the roading network.

I believe there are properties there where the roading network can cope (eg up to blind corner adjacent to the unnumbered Jacobson property between 1187 and 1131 Moonshine Road), and where the land can accommodate on site wastewater treatment without adverse effects on the environment, and where smaller allotments can contribute to a more vibrant community with both living and working opportunities and a smaller carbon footprint.

I also believe that, if the zone and its policies/standards are carefully designed, then creating rural lifestyle lots can have benefits for the environment, in that extensive native and amenity plantings, riparian protection, and wildlife corridors become more likely. Such benefits have been achieved on the Jacobson properties already.

Additional dwellings achieving the above benefits while avoiding effects would also have the effect of providing more demand for public transport to and from the nearby city centres (and making such public transport more viable)

Relief sought

Create a new Special Purpose Zone allowing more intensive rural subdivision (or extend the Rural Lifestyle Zone) to the north and east of the FUZ Judgeford Flats after careful consideration of where and how that can be done:

- without adversely impacting the roading network and the environment (in particular the Moonshine and Pauatahanui Streams and Pauatahanui inlet downstream);
- in a way that enables a more vibrant community in the area with opportunities to both live and work (with benefits of reducing travel and carbon footprint in an area not well served by public transport); and
- in a way that enables and promotes environmental restoration including riparian plantings, native and amenity plantings, and wildlife corridors