

26<sup>th</sup> October 2021

Porirua City Council  
16 Cobham Court  
Porirua 5022

Attention: Maria Joslin- Consultation Support Coordinator

By email only: [Maria.Joslin@porirucity.govt.nz](mailto:Maria.Joslin@porirucity.govt.nz); [dpreview@porirucity.govt.nz](mailto:dpreview@porirucity.govt.nz)

Dear Maria,

**RE: PROPOSED PORIRUA DISTRICT PLAN HEARINGS**

**Hearing 2: Strategic Directions (Natural Environment and Tangata Whenua), Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Natural Character, Natural Features and Landscapes, Public Access and Papakāinga.**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1.** I refer to the abovementioned matter set down for hearing commencing 29<sup>th</sup> October 2021. Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) will not be presenting evidence in person, as Waka Kotahi is largely in agreement with the recommendations set out in the Officer's reports (Part B).
- 1.2.** This statement is prepared with the appropriate authority within Waka Kotahi. Waka Kotahi is identified as submitter **82** in the Officer's Reports (Part B).
- 1.3.** It would be appreciated if you could table this statement before the Proposed Porirua District Plan (PPDP) Hearings Panel.

## 2.0 Waka Kotahi Submissions

2.1 A summary of the Waka Kotahi mandate, objectives and interest in the Porirua district has been covered off in both the submissions.

2.2 This hearing statement relates to Hearing 2. 16 of the Waka Kotahi submission points are considered in this hearing<sup>1</sup>.

2.3 Waka Kotahi has reviewed the Officer's Reports (Part B) and in particular, the recommendation(s) with respect to the Waka Kotahi submission(s). Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officers recommendations. This is outlined in the summary table included as Attachment A to this Hearing Statement.

## 3.0 Concluding Statement

3.1 Thank you for your time and consideration of this Hearing Statement. Should you have any questions regarding this statement, please do not hesitate to get in touch: [Claudia.Jones@nzta.govt.nz](mailto:Claudia.Jones@nzta.govt.nz) or 07 958 9614.

Kind regards,



Claudia Jones  
Planner  
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

---

<sup>1</sup> 82.112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Summary of the Waka Kotahi position in regard to the Reporting Officers recommendations.**

**Proposed Porirua District Plan Hearing 2.**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Waka Kotahi submission</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>	<b>Waka Kotahi Response</b>
<b>82.117</b>	<p><b>ECO-P11-3</b></p> <p>Does not support the allowing of earthworks within a Significant Natural Area where it can be demonstrated that any earthworks within a wetland are avoided.</p> <p>SNA112 contains a wetland in which includes planted vegetation that is located within the state highway road reserve. This may restrict undertaking standard maintenance activities within the road reserve.</p> <p>Required to undertake standard maintenance activities in order to continue the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</p>	<p><b>Reject</b></p> <p><i>I do not agree with the changes requested by submitters to ECO-P11-3, in fact I consider that ECO-P11-3 should be removed altogether following gazettal of the NPS-FM and NES-FW, as outlined in section 3.7 of this report. It is now redundant as it duplicates clause 54 of the NESFW.</i></p>	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi agrees with removing this provision as the gazettal of the NPS-FM and NES-FW means it is already provided for.</p>
<b>82.118</b>	<p><b>ECO-R1</b></p> <p>Supports this provision as it enables the trimming and removal of indigenous vegetation for the purpose of</p>	<p><b>Reject</b></p> <p><i>In regards to the submissions from Waka Kotahi [82.118], DOC [126.18], and GWRC</i></p>	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p>

	<p>ensuring the safe and efficient operation of any formed public road. Seeks that point a.iv of the provision be amended to include Statutory Authorities as the provision is currently limited to Porirua City Council (PCC) only. It is unclear why the provision is limited to PCC given there is no effects reason to do so.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi notes that the interpretation of the provision is that the “formed width of the road” is not just limited to the seal and includes gravelled areas and barriers that form part of the formed road.</p>	<p><i>[137.52], I consider that ECO-R1-1.a.iv should be deleted in line with relief sought by Porirua City Council [11.42] as rules relating to infrastructure are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter (See Part B Infrastructure s42A report which addresses the substance of these submission points).</i></p>	<p>Waka Kotahi agrees that this rule should be deleted as provisions relating to infrastructure are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter.</p>
82.120	<p><b>ECO-R4</b></p> <p>Support in part - Supports a permitted activity status within a Significant Natural Area. Considers that the provision does not provide for earthworks associated with the ongoing safety and efficiency of the transport network. Considers that point a.ii of the provision be amended to include Statutory Authorities as the provision is currently limited to Porirua City Council (PCC) and Wellington Regional Council only. Does not understand why the provision is limited to PCC and</p>	<p><b>Reject</b></p> <p><i>Waka Kotahi [82.120] seeks an amendment to ECO-R4-1.a.ii, however I consider this criterion should be deleted as requested by Porirua City Council [11.43] as rules relating to infrastructure are addressed in the infrastructure chapter (Part B Infrastructure s42A report addresses the substance of this submission point).</i></p>	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer’s recommendation.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi agrees that this rule should be deleted as provisions relating to infrastructure are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter.</p>

	Wellington Regional Council given there is no effects reason to do so.		
<b>82.121</b>	<b>ECO-R7</b> Does not support this rule and considers it is unnecessary duplication. Specifically supports ECO-R1.1 and ECO-R1.2. Considers these rules are more appropriate.	<b>Reject</b> <i>Five submitters seek ECO-R7 be amended: Porirua City Council [11.45], Hamish Tunley [52.1], Andrea &amp; Karl Simonlehner [110.2], Robyn Smith [168.74, 168.75], Waka Kotahi [82.121].</i>  <i>The three submissions that seek deletion of this rule do so because it duplicates ECO-R1-2, and any other activities are captured by catch-all rule ECO-R9. I agree that the rule should be deleted for these reasons.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.  Waka Kotahi notes that the Reporting Officer stated within their report that Waka Kotahi requested an amendment to this rule. Therefore, our submission point was rejected. However, Waka Kotahi believe this assessment was an error as submission point 82.121 requested that this rule be deleted.
<b>82.114</b>	<b>ECO-P1</b> Support- Retain as notified	<b>Accept</b> <i>Agree with submitter.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
<b>82.115</b>	<b>ECO-P3</b> Support- Retain as notified	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation because

			the amendments do not substantively change the intent of the policy.
82.116	<b>ECO-P7</b> Support- Retain as notified	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation because the amendments do not substantively change the intent of the policy.
82.112	<b>ECO-S1</b> Support- Retain as notified	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation because the amendments do not substantively change what the standard achieves.
82.119	<b>ECO- R2</b> Support- Retain as notified	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation because the amendments do not substantively change the intent of the rule.
82.123	<b>NFL-P4</b> Supports the intent of this policy. Provision for regionally significant infrastructure is not provided presently within the policy framework. Suggests its addition here, or as a separate policy. It does not provide for regionally	<b>Reject</b> <i>With respect to the infrastructure matter, the provisions in the NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter do not apply to infrastructure. The Infrastructure chapter</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.

	significant infrastructure as a form of appropriate use and development.	<i>manages infrastructure within overlays, with this approach described in Part 1 - General Approach of the PDP. In addition, the introduction to the Infrastructure Chapter states "... This chapter also manages infrastructure within Overlays, which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions..."</i>	Waka Kotahi agrees that this provision does not need to apply to infrastructure because such matters are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter.
<b>82.125</b>	<b>NFL-P7</b> Support in part- Recognises the importance of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes (in the coastal environment). The current policy framework does not however appropriately recognise regionally significant infrastructure within the coastal environment. The policy is considered too stringent for development associated with the ongoing operational and functional needs of regionally significant. Does not support this policy if provision for the functional and operational need for infrastructure be located in these areas is not provided for.	<b>Reject</b> <i>With respect to the infrastructure matter, the provisions in the NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter do not apply to infrastructure. The Infrastructure chapter manages infrastructure within overlays, with this approach described in Part 1 - General Approach of the PDP. In addition, the introduction to the Infrastructure Chapter states "... This chapter also manages infrastructure within Overlays, which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions..."</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.  Waka Kotahi agrees that this provision does not need to apply to infrastructure because such matters are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter.
<b>82.128</b>	<b>NFL-R4</b>	<b>Reject</b>	<b>Supports</b>

	<p>Oppose- Does not support a discretionary activity status for buildings or structures located within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape. The rule restricts structures which may be associated with the safe and efficient operation of the transport network. Considers that a restricted discretionary status is appropriate for buildings and structures associated with the ongoing safe and efficient operation of the transport network, with matters of discretion being restricted to the ongoing safety and efficiency of the transport network. The rule has the same reference number (1) as a permitted activity under the same provision. This should be amended accordingly to avoid confusion when referencing the rule.</p>	<p><i>With respect to the infrastructure matter, the provisions in the NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter do not apply to infrastructure. The Infrastructure chapter manages infrastructure within overlays, with this approach described in Part 1 - General Approach of the PDP. In addition, the introduction to the Infrastructure Chapter states "... This chapter also manages infrastructure within Overlays, which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions..."</i></p>	<p>Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi agrees that this provision does not need to apply to infrastructure because such matters are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter.</p>
82.129	<p><b>NFL-S1</b></p> <p>Support in part- Supports this provision. Considers that the rule should exempt earthworks associated with regionally significant infrastructure. This will allow for the ongoing safe and efficient operation of the transport network.</p>	<p><b>Reject</b></p> <p><i>With respect to the infrastructure matter, the provisions in the NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter do not apply to infrastructure. The Infrastructure chapter manages infrastructure within overlays, with this approach described in Part 1 - General Approach of the PDP. In addition, the</i></p>	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <p>Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p> <p>Waka Kotahi agrees that this provision does not need to apply to infrastructure and because such</p>



		<i>introduction to the Infrastructure Chapter states “... This chapter also manages infrastructure within Overlays, which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions...”</i>	matters are addressed in the Infrastructure Chapter.
<b>82-127</b>	<b>NFL-R2</b> <b>Support-</b> Supports a permitted activity status for the removal of indigenous vegetation within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape or Special Amenity Landscape.	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer’s recommendation because the amendments do not substantively change the rule requirements.
<b>82.126</b>	<b>NFL-R1</b> Support- Supports a permitted activity status for earthworks or land disturbance within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape, subject to the matters to which compliance is to be achieved.	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer’s recommendation because the amendments do not substantively change the rule requirements.
<b>82.130</b>	<b>NFL-S2</b> Support- Supports this provision as it provides for the removal of indigenous vegetation that is 1m either side of, or within, an existing formed road. Notes that their interpretation of the provision is that the “formed width of the road” is not just limited to the seal and includes	<b>Accept in part</b> <i>Subject to amendments made in response to other submissions.</i>	<b>Supports</b> Waka Kotahi supports the Reporting Officer’s recommendation because the amendments do not substantively change what the standard achieves.

	gravelled areas and barriers that form part of the formed road.		
--	---	--	--