UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")

IN THE MATTER of Proposed Porirua District Plan: Hearing 4

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF KAREN TRACY WILLIAMS ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA - HOMES AND COMMUNITIES (81 / FS65)

PLANNING

11 February 2022

1. Summary Statement

1.1 My full name is Karen Tracy Williams. I am providing planning evidence on behalf of Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities ("**Kāinga Ora**") in relation to submissions made on the Proposed Porirua District Plan ("**PDP**"). My qualifications and experience areset out in my Evidence in Chief ("**EIC**") dated 21 January 2022. This summary briefly sets out an overview of my EIC and Rebuttal Evidence and responds to some aspects raised in Mr Smeaton's Section 42A Supplementary Evidence.

2. Summary of EIC and responses to S42A Supplementary Evidence

Infrastructure

2.1 In my EIC, I recommend changes to INF-O2 and INF-P5 to alter the way in which reverse sensitivity effects are framed within the provisions. I continue to support the recommendations outlined in my EIC.

2.2 I also recommended changes to INF-P6 in relation to managing adverse effects on the National Grid. I have since reviewed Ms Whitney's evidence (including rebuttal). Upon reflection, I find that I agree in part with her suggested changes to INF-P6; although I suggest some further changes as outlined in Attachment A of this Statement. In my opinion Ms Whitney's revised drafting of INF-P6, incorporating the further changes I have suggested in Attachment A of this Statement, both gives better effect to Policy 10 of the NPS-ET and provides greater clarity for the assessment of applications compared with those recommended by Mr Smeaton in his Supplementary Evidence.

2.3 I also sought changes to INF-P9 (renumbered to INF-P11 in the s42A report). I have read the rebuttal evidence of Ms Whitney and the supplementary evidence of Mr Smeaton and agree with their conclusions.

Transport

2.4 I recommended that notification preclusion statements (for both public and limited notification) be applied to Rules TR-R1, TR-R2, TR-R3, and TR-R4. I continue to support this, for the reasons outlined in my EIC.

2.5 My evidence recommended changes to the restriction on the number of vehicle crossings (submission related to INF-S26, which has been relocated to TR chapter as TR-S5), which has been carried through in the suggestions of the Joint Witness Statement on Transport.

2.6 I also recommended amendments to TR-S6 (revised to TR-S7) to accommodate vehicle manoeuvring within a site so that vehicles exit in a

forward-facing direction. I continue to support this recommendation, as informed by the advice of Ms Crafer.

Rail Corridor Setbacks

2.7 I have reviewed the rebuttal evidence of Ms Grinlinton-Hancock, and the Council's supplementary evidence on this matter. I continue to support a set-back distance as specified in my EIC, being no greater than 2m in the residential zones, and 2.5m in mixed use and commercial zones.

2.8 I also consider the recommended wording within my EIC for the Matters of Discretion on this matter to be appropriate and more applicable to the effects being controlled by this standard.

Earthworks

2.9 I recommended amendments to include a non-notification clause for EW-R1 to preclude public and limited notification. I acknowledge the Council's supplementary evidence has supported a change to preclude public notification. For the reasons set out in my EIC, I continue to support preclusion of limited notification.

2.10 The Council's supplementary evidence accepts my recommended amendments with regard to EW-S2 in relation to the maximum permitted cut height or fill depth, with small refinements. I support these changes.

Vibration and Noise Controls

2.11 The issue being managed through the proposed planning framework has been incorrectly identified as being one of reverse sensitivity effects upon the rail and road networks. In my view, the evidence provided does not signal that there is indeed a significant reverse sensitivity effect that is manifesting itself through the curtailing of road or rail movements, nor that the particular noise environment within the Porirua justifies their introduction. I accept that controls may be required to manage health and amenity effects, although note that the extent of such effects is not currently understood through the evidence provided to-date.

2.12 Any mitigation measures required to be undertaken by noise sensitive activities within surrounding environment to manage noise and vibration effects from the nearby rail and road network should be based on evidential modelling of the Porirua networks to determine likely noise levels (following the adoption of BPO at source). I consider a more tailored and evidence-based approach is required to appropriately identify the spatial extent to which any necessary controls might reasonably apply to manage potential adverse health and amenity effects from road and rail

noise affecting surrounding sensitive activities.

2.13 The inclusion of acoustic and vibration controls with a fixed metric distance each side of the outer boundary of a State Highway or rail corridor ("**Controls**"), in the absence of evidential modelling and management of unreasonable noise at source, is an inefficient planning response to manage reverse sensitivity effects.

3. Summary of Rebuttal

3.1 My rebuttal evidence addressed the following matters:

(a) Generalised application of the rule framework to apply to any additions, removing the 50m² threshold;

(b) The introduction of controls related to outdoor noise; and

(c) The conclusion reached in the report prepared by Acoustic Engineering Services relating to building costs.

3.2 In my opinion, removing the threshold of additions over 50m² and applying the framework to apply to *all* additions is overly restrictive and the costs of the required mitigation would likely outweigh any benefits.

3.3 My overriding issue with the outdoor noise performance standard is that for users of the Plan and the community residing within the 100m/50m corridors (particularly in existing urban settings), the ability to achieve compliance and technical skills required to assess matters renders the rules onerous and unduly complicated. When the construction costs and practical considerations such as amenity and maintenance are included, I have some concerns as to the appropriateness of the standard (particularly for additions to existing activities), notwithstanding that technically it may well reduce noise levels.

3.4 Regarding the conclusion reached in the report prepared by Acoustic Engineering Services, while the report provides some outcomes in respect of costs per units as a percentage increase, a number of factors are not articulated clearly in the report such as whether the dwellings are single storey or more, the size of the dwellings and/or the build value contained in the Building Consent. It appears that the samples are based on a new-build scenario only and do not consider costs implications of a minor addition to an existing dwelling as a percentage. I am therefore unclear as to the cost implications arising froma minor addition within an established residential area are as a percentage cost to the owner.

Karen Williams
11 February 2022

ATTACHMENT A

My amendments to Ms Whitney's suggested revision of INF-P6[1] are shown in red strikethrough/underline text.

INF-P6 Adverse effects on the National Grid

Protect the safe and efficient operation, maintenance and repair, upgrading, removal and development of the National Grid from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, by:

1. Avoiding land uses (including sensitive activities) and buildings and structures building platforms located within the National Grid Yard that may directly affect or otherwise compromise the National Grid;

~~1A. Avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid.~~

2. Only allowing subdivision within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor or the National Grid Pāuatahanui Substation Yard where it can be demonstrated that the National Grid will not be compromised, taking into account:

    a. The impact of subdivision layout and design on the operation, maintenance, and potential upgrade and development of the National Grid, including reasonable access requirements;

    b. The ability of any potential future development to comply with NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances;

    c. The extent to which the design and layout of the subdivision demonstrates that a suitable building platform(s) for a principal building or dwelling can be provided outside of the National Grid Yard for each new lot;

    d. The risk to the structural integrity of the National Grid;

    e. The extent to which the subdivision design and consequential development will avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid and the risk of injury and/or property damage from the National Grid;

---

[1] *Evidence of Pauline Whitney, 21 January 2022, at paragraph 7.67.*

f. The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted within the National Grid Yard; and

g. The outcome of any consultation with, and technical advice from, Transpower.