

**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**

---

**Response of Caroline Elizabeth Rachlin on behalf of Porirua City Council  
to interim question from the Hearing Panel  
Date: 23 March 2023**

---

## **INTRODUCTION:**

- 1 My full name is Caroline Elizabeth Rachlin. I am employed as a Senior Policy Planner for Porirua City Council.
- 2 I have prepared this statement of evidence on behalf of the Porirua City Council (**Council**) in respect of technical matter related to matters arising from questions from the Panel relating to submissions and further submissions on the Proposed Porirua District Plan (**PDP**) and Variation 1.
- 3 Specifically, this statement of evidence relates to matters in Hearing Stream 7.
- 4 I am authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

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

- 5 Appendix C of the section 42A report – Overarching sets out my qualifications and experience.
- 6 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 2023.

## **SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

- 7 This statement of evidence provides a response to the following interim question raised by the Hearing Panel in their email of 22 March 2023 follows:
  7. *As regards in relation to boundary controls for the purposes of protecting adjacent heritage items or sites of significance to Māori, please identify where the different elements of the Section 77(j) evaluation supporting those controls are addressed?*
8. I have interpreted the reference within the question to Section 77(j) to mean to S77J - Requirements in relation to evaluation report. However,

should the Hearings Panel have intended otherwise I could address this within a final reply.

## EVIDENCE

8 The Section 77J evaluation supporting the site specific controls for sites adjacent to heritage items and heritage settings, and sites adjacent to sites and areas of significance to Māori is contained in the following section 32 reports and supporting technical reports.

- Section 32 Evaluation Report Part A – Overview to Section 32 Evaluation - (**32 – Part A**)
- Section 32 Evaluation Report Part B: Urban intensification – MDRS and NPS-UD Policy 3 (**s32 – Part B**):
- Historic Heritage Qualifying Matters Assessment 2022, Gregory Vossler and Ian Bowman (**Historic Heritage Assessment**)
- Porirua Variation 1 and Plan Change 19 Qualifying Matters Assessment, Property Economics 2022 (**Qualifying Matters Assessment, Property Economics 2022**)

9 The following table identifies which particular sections of these reports address the requirements under S77J(3).

Section 77J	Assessment in s32	Reports relied on
S77J(3)(a)(i) and S77J(3)(a)(ii)	See s32 – Part B, section 11.2.2.2 <sup>1</sup> , pages 89-93.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic Heritage Assessment.</li> <li>• Refer also s32 – Part B, section 11.2.2.2, page 92 regarding</li> </ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> Evaluation under s77J and s77P of qualifying matters that arise from the application of s77I(a-i) and s77O(a-i)

		engagement with TROTR.
S77J(3)(b)	See s32 – Part B, section 11.2.2.2, top of page 93.	Qualifying Matters Assessment, Property Economics 2022.
S77J(3)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of the costs and broader impacts is contained generally throughout s32 – Part B, section 11.2.2.2.</li> <li>See s32 – Part A, section 2.7.3 - Evaluation of qualifying matters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualifying Matters Assessment, Property Economics 2022. This contains an assessment of lost development capacity and a cost benefit analysis at section 9.3.</li> <li>Historic Heritage Assessment</li> </ul>

**Date:** 23/03/2023

*ORachin*

.....