

**Before the Hearings Panel  
At Porirua City Council**

**Under** Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

**In the matter of** the Proposed Porirua District Plan

**Between** **Various**

**Submitters**

**And** **Porirua City Council**

**Respondent**

---

**Statement of supplementary planning evidence of Gina Sweetman on behalf  
of Porirua City Council**

**Date:** 28 October 2021

---

## **INTRODUCTION:**

- 1 My full name is Gina Marie Sweetman. I am a consultant planner, engaged by Porirua City Council (the Council) for the purpose of the Proposed Porirua District Plan (PDP).
- 2 I have read the respective expert evidence of:
  - a. Mr João Paulo Silva for the Department of Conservation
  - b. Ms Pauline Whitney for Transpower NZ Ltd
- 3 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Council in respect of technical related matters arising from the submissions and further submissions on the PDP.
- 4 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to the matters in Chapter NE – Natural Environment, in Part 2 of the PDP. Mr McDonnell is addressing Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities legal submission in respect of papakāinga in his statement.
- 5 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

## **QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND CODE OF CONDUCT**

- 6 Appendix C of my section 42A report sets out my qualifications and experience.
- 7 I confirm that I am continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 8 My statement of evidence addresses the following matters:

- 8.1 Recommended new Objective NE-O2
- 8.2 The status of the strategic objectives and their relationship with other objectives within the PDP
- 8.3 Maintaining indigenous biodiversity in Porirua.

#### **RECOMMENDED NEW OBJECTIVE NE-O2**

- 9 I have considered Ms Whitney's evidence as to my recommended NE-O2 in respect of maintaining indigenous biodiversity. While I remain of the view that NE-O2 should be included within the PDP, I agree that its wording could be refined. For the reasons given by Ms Whitney, I concur that the word "possible" should be replaced with "appropriate", so that it would read:

**NE-O2 Maintaining and restoring indigenous biodiversity values**

Indigenous biodiversity values in the District are maintained and, where appropriate, restored.

#### **STATUS OF THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

- 10 Ms Whitney has also recommended amendments to the introduction to each of the strategic objectives chapters to explain their status and how they relate to the objectives contained through the PDP.
- 11 The role of the strategic objectives is set out both in the General Approach chapter as well as in the introduction to each of the strategic objectives chapters. I agree with Ms Whitney that it would be helpful for their status and role in the Plan to be further clarified. However, I do not agree that the reference to any significant resource consent applications should be deleted. In my view, it is appropriate that the strategic objectives, which set the scene for the Plan and the outcomes sought for the City as a whole, should be appropriately considered for significant resource consents, particularly where there may be tensions at play.

12 In response to Ms Whitney's evidence, I recommend that the following wording be inserted into:

12.1 The General approach chapter as follows:

They reflect the intended outcomes to be achieved through the implementation of the District Plan. The strategic objectives should be considered alongside the objectives, policies and rules in Parts 2 and 3 of the Plan. The strategic objectives will be particularly relevant for any future changes to the Plan and any significant resource consent applications.

12.2 The introduction of each strategic objectives chapter as follows:

The objectives, policies and rules in Parts 2 and 3 of the District Plan implement the strategic objectives and reconcile any tensions between them. The strategic objectives should be considered alongside the objectives, policies and rules in Parts 2 and 3 of the Plan.

#### **MAINTAINING INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY IN PORIRUA**

13 I have carefully considered Mr Silva's evidence. Having done so, my view as set out in section 3.2.2 of my s42A report, supported by section 5.3 of the section 32 report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, has not changed. In my professional opinion, the approach taken in the PDP to maintaining indigenous biodiversity is robust and appropriate to Porirua City, its particular circumstances and the evidence base which supports the provisions. Mr Silva has not provided any evidence demonstrating a resource management issue or an evaluation under section 32AA as to why the Department of Conservation's request is the most appropriate means of achieving the Plan's objectives or the Purpose of the Act.

14 I note that Mr Silva has not addressed the restrictions under s76(4A) and (4B) of the RMA that limit the ability of any territorial authority to include

“blanket” provisions for trees within urban environments, which was a matter of particular consideration in developing the PDP provisions.

**Date:** 28 October 2021

Gina Sweetman

Consultant Planner

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Gina Sweetman", is centered on the page. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small dot at the end.